First Presbyterian Church
SOUTH AMBOY, NEW JERSEY

G. E. SEHLBREDE, D. D., M A., PASTOR
RESIDENCE 146 N. BROADWAY
TELEPHONE, SO. AMBOY 588

March 23d. 1928.

Rev.W. Courtland Robinson, D.D,
Delhi, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Robinson;-

I want to thank you for having put into my hands your splendid pamphlet, " Princeton Theological Seminary. Its troubles as viewed by AMICUS ".

I am unknown to you, but want you to know that I greatly appreciate all you say in the pamphlet,and I am sure it will much good in aiding the settlement of conditions in Princeton and thus throught out the whole church.

I wish a copy could be put into the hands of every Elder in our whole church; I am sure it would give them much information they do not now have.

We are fallen upon trying times,but it is such times that bring out the faithful for firm declaration and readiness for sacrifice. It is one of the testing times which purifies the church.

The fairness and the thoroughness of your statements should convince all who read it to stand for the Old Truth,and for the Old Church, and for Princeton without change as to bodies of Controll.

With all good wishes,and thanking you again for the pamphlet, I am

Sincerely yours, G E Sehlbrede.

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

February 10, 1928.

Rev. W. C. Robinson, D.D.
Delhi, New York

My Dear Robinson:

I think you are wise in signing the pamphlet that is to be sent out. The writer of it would be known after a while and it seems to me that the pamphlet will be stronger and appeal more surely by having the writer's name. I do not know any other man who could have written it just as you have done. I shall want a number of copies to distribute where they will do good. It doesn't surprise me that Warfield should deprecate the issuing of pamphlets on the ground that the Committee has been given charge of the whole matter. I think he will be a useful man on the Committee. I was glad when he was appointed as one of the members. I do not agree with you as to Speer's purposes and attitudes. I have always believed in his sincerity and I explained to myself is unwillingness to enter into controversy by reason of his being a secretary. I also agree with you as to the unwisdom of those who in their desire to maintain the theological position of Princeton are too unbending and dogmatic about non-essential things. It is absolutely necessary for us to win the support of a large body of men who are themselves sound, but who call themselves "middle of the road people". They are influenced by fairness and courtesy and consideration, and a willingness to allow some liberty in methods and personal views. I have felt that Laird has been the most tactful and influential representative of our cause.

I suppose you have had Alexander's manuscript. All the conservative members of the Board of Directors will be asked to sign it. I made some suggestions in the way of omission, but I am quite willing to sign it with my brethren. I have been asked to help raise money for its publication, but I do not feel any great pressure on me to do so because there are those managing it who could finance it with less trouble than the smallest gift from me would involve.

You have done a good piece of work. I hope and pray it may be blessed beyond our expectations even. My judgment is that this is the line to pursue with any hope of success. Give my regards to your wife to whom the credit of all the good that is in you belongs.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

February 3, 1928.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson, D.D.
Delhi, New York

My Dear Dr. Robinson:

The pamphlet on the situation at Princeton issued under the name "Amicus" seems to me the fairest and most tolerant of all the statements I have thus far seen. It meets my heartiest approval. I believe that to the ordinary person who is not prejudiced, consciously or unconsciously, by reason of his contacts with the issues involved, this pamphlet will not only be enlightening, but will be helpful toward making a just and fair opinion of the merits of the case.

I have not had an opportunity of hearing an expression of opinion from any of the circle of those deeply interested. It maybe that McCartney and Alexander think as highly of it as I do. Some day soon I hope to see McCartney and have him express his opinion.

It is my hope that the pamphlet may be sent widely to the ministers and elders of the church. I would be very glad to have a number of copies for personal use. I would also be glad, if you feel like doing so, to hear of the reaction reported to you. Of course, as the pamphlet does not mention the author, only uncertainly can you know of its reception.

It was with much regret that I could not come to the meeting and it was with some surprise that I heard that Dr. Craig encouraged you so much. I have not heard a word from Laird for many moons.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Enclosed are two small checks to be used in helping to defray expenses-

PHILADELPHIA CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION

DEPARTMENT OF EXAMINATION

WM. M. HARDT
EXAMINER

April 2, 1928.

My dear Dr. Robinson,

As an inconspicous layman in the Presbyterian Church, and as your warm personal friend, allow me to heartily commend your pamphlet "Princeton Theological Seminary". It is exhaustive and illuminating; couched in beautiful language, yet succinct. It should be generally considered convincing. It so clearly typifies the impartiality conservatism and true Christian character of the author.

Very sincerely yours,

Wm M Hardt

2226 N 52nd St.

Phila

Monrovia, California,
February 23rd, 1928

The Rev. Wm. Courtland Robinson, D.D.,
Delhi, New York.

My dear Dr. Robinson: Permit me, please, to say how much I appreciate your pamphlet on the Princeton Seminary tragedy.

To think that Dr. Dixon in face of your clear, calm, and adequate presentation is able to lead a majority of New Brunswick presbytery to refuse to join Chester Presbytery in their protest is amazing, and leaves us little to hope. The faculty of the Seminary might at least see that if there is sufficient justification for divergence among them there will be equal justification for the church at large to follow their example. May the Spirit of the Lord lift up a standard against them in the ruling elders of the church, seeing that there are indications that muddied waters are not to their taste. To have Dr. Dixon prove a bell-wether for the majority of New Brunswick presbytery at a time when New York presbytery, like bronchos, is running wild, is the more staggering.

I am in hopes that the Directors will soon see their way to declare the president's chair in the Seminary vacant.

With best regards, I am Sincerely yours,

C. R. Brodhead

Princeton Seminary, '87.

ROBERT C. STONE
PASTOR, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
565 EUCLID AVENUE
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

Rev. W. C. Robinson, D.D.

Kind Friend, I have just read your very timely article on Princeton Theological Seminary. This impresses me as thebest article I have read on the subject. I am not a Princeton man, know nothing of the place but by hearsay. As a loyal Presbyterian I am interested. If more of our men could stick to facts andin the kindly manner you have stated them, the Kingdom would come faster.

I have been, and perhaps am, prejudiced. But I am for the church and for the Seminary. If you have included all the grounds of controversy in your recent article, I would agree heartily with your conclusions.

I thank you for putting out such a kindly article in this time of heated discussion.

Very Cordially Yours,

Feb. 22nd. 1928.

R. C. Stone,

First Presbyterian Church
425 IRIS STREET
REV. JOSEPH TAYLOR BRITAN, D. D., PASTOR
Box 2544
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

Feb 17 1928

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson D.D.
Delhi, New York.

My dear Dr Robinson:

Thank you for your illuminating and sane pamphlet on Princeton Seminary received an hour or two ago. I finished it at one sitting. It seems to me to be unanswerable and certainly it is fair to all. Why is it that so many conservative men are so blind and credulous (if not culpable) as to believe that Princeton would or could be safe in the hands of liberals and liberal sympathisers?

You have done a fine piece of work and I wish to express my appreciation and thanks.

Fraternally yours,

J. T. Britan.

REV. J. MONT. TRAVIS
STATED CLERK, PRESBYTERY OF DENVER
651 HIGH STREET
DENVER

February 17, 1928

The Rev. Wm Courtland Robinson, D.D.
Delhi, New York

Dear Doctor Robinson:-

I received today and have just finished reading your excellent pamphlet on the Princeton Seminary. I believe it to be of inestimable value if only it can be gotten into the hands of the Commissioners to the next Assembly. I hope arrangements will be made at once to have a copy sent to every Commissioner as soon as his name is announced.

I am wondering how widely the present issue is being distributed. Since I have received a copy I am assuming that it has been sent to all Ministers whose names appear in the late Minutes; but I wish the Elders might also be reached.

I am enclosing the names of the elders of our Presbytery and I could furnish you with the names of the Clerks of Sessions of the entire Synod of Colorado. The Minutes of the Synod of Indiana for this year gives the names of ALL the elders in that Synod.

If financial provision has not been made for this distribution I will be glad to make a small contribution toward it if you will let me know.

Fraternally yours

J. MONT TRAVIS.

P.S. I have known Dr. Stevenson for many years. I am afraid you are letting him down too easy. I think he is responsible for the whole trouble.

790 Woodbury Road
Pasadena, Cal
Feb. 15. 1928

Dear Comstock:-

I do not claim special perspicacity in attributing the "Omicron" pamphlet to you — for it so clearly reflected your character that any one who really knows you would naturally enough detect the cipher.

It is a most important step that you, or some one of like mind, is taking

in mailing out 10,000 copies, to ministers of our church.

I do hope and pray, dear Mother, that good fruit and much of it may come from this seed planting.

I am sailing to New York via Panama Canal & Havana, March 18, arriving April 4. Then to the Nassau Club, Princeton, where my headquarters will be for a season.

Thanking you for your good letter and with affectionate regards I am cordially yours

Lester W. Beach.

CHAMBERS-WYLIE MEMORIAL
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
BROAD STREET, BELOW SPRUCE

REV. JOHN GRANT NEWMAN, M.A. D.D., PASTOR
4642 HAZEL AVENUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Feb. 24, 1928

My dear Dr. Robinson:

Your pamphlet on the condition of things at Princeton Seminary has just come; and I have taken time off to read it. So there, now!

You have stated the case, as I believe, truthfully and calmly. I want to write you to say just this. You are fair and unafraid. There is no reason at all for any changes in the two-board management. I think I see that.

CHAMBERS-WYLIE MEMORIAL
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
BROAD STREET, BELOW SPRUCE

REV. JOHN GRANT NEWMAN, M.A. D.D., PASTOR
4642 HAZEL AVENUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I have believed all along that the matter is one of "executive" ability; or if you please, of "administration". Up that I am now convinced after reading what you have to say.

Personally, I hope the assembly will see this, and in some way, find a back out of the tangle. Let both Boards remain as they are. Let the Directors remain directors. And I think, too, if the Trustees can be dispensed with, without troublesome litigation.

Up to the present I,

CHAMBERS-WYLIE MEMORIAL
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
BROAD STREET, BELOW SPRUCE

REV. JOHN GRANT NEWMAN, M.A. D.D., PASTOR
4642 HAZEL AVENUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

personally, have had little interest in the Fairmount. But you have awakened in my mind a sense of fairness, and this have aroused in me an interest. Of course I may not see all that is involved. You have helped me to see much, however.

Should I go to the next assembly, (which is not possible, as things stand in our Presbytery,) I should stand positively for the Directors.

Your statement of the case should be read by every preacher in our great church. It would do untold

CHAMBERS-WYLIE MEMORIAL
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
BROAD STREET, BELOW SPRUCE

REV. JOHN GRANT NEWMAN, M.A. D.D., PASTOR
4642 HAZEL AVENUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

good. Of that I am sure.

In short, if the next Assembly will but refer this tangle back to the two Boards at Princeton, and tell them to "wash their own dirty clothes", and find the way to harmony and peace, it can be done. I believe it will be done. If the "administration" is at fault let the Directors say so, and find the remedy. And what that remedy is, is not far to seek.

Most heartily Yours,

John Grant Newman

E. A. Zeller, Jr.
Clerk of Session
Wm. H. Hensel
Treas. of Session

MT. AIRY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Philadelphia North Presbytery
Germantown and Mt. Pleasant Aves.
Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. John Calhoun, D.D., Pastor
33 E. Mt. Pleasant Avenue

Jos. C. Ferguson, Jr.
Sec. Board of Trustees
E. G. Kolb
Treas. Board of Trustees

2/24/28

Dear Court:

That "Amicus" is great! In my judgment you showed up the Seminary affair in its true light.

If ever I get in ecclesiastical trouble I will engage you to write it up — provided my side is right. Otherwise, it would cut.

Congratulations?

As ever

John Calhoun

PRESBYTERIAN MANSE
AVOCA, N. Y.

FRANCIS JAMES MALZARD
MINISTER

February 24 1928

Rev. W.Courtland Robinson
Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Sir and Brother:-

Your monograph anent Princeton Seminary is at hand. I am not a Princeton man, and by no stretch of imagination could it be possible that I should be a Commissioner to the next General Assembly, seeing that I have but recently come into this Presbytery (Steuben).

But I cannot fail to be interested in the matter of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, and without any bias or attempt at captiousness would like to ask you a few questions:-

1. The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church should not, surely, be the Seminary of a party, either Liberal or Conservative; New School or Old School. It is being claimed by Dr. Machen and his friends that Princeton should remain the Seminary of the Old School, but surely that is to defeat the purpose of its very name. Would it not be better for Professors of every shade of Theological opinion be appointed to its chairs. Say Robert Dick Wilson and C.P.Fagnanni in the department of Old Testament? Both are Presbyterian ministers in good standing and both are unqualifiedly able O.T.schilars. Then students would have full opportunity of hearing both sides of the case and be abl to judge for themselves. Or say J.G.Machen and A.M.Dulles in Apologetics.? In this case both are Princeton graduates, holding somewhat different views.

2. With reference to Dr. Machen himself, I have no intimate knowledge of the gentleman, but of course there is plenty of evidence to show his obvious irritability. But a rumor is in circulation to the effect that he is opposed to National Prohibition, and has opposed resolutions favoring the enforcement of the Volstead Act on the floor of the Presbytery of New Brunswick. Another rumor is current to the effect that he declared publicly that Abraham Lincoln was the greatest scoundrel that ever was in the White House. Now Sir, I know full well that rumor is a vary dangerous ground to form a judgment upon, but it would be well to have some concrete evidence to the contrary.

3. Certainly Dr. Macartney did say while he was Moderator that Presbyterian ministers were to teach what the General Assembly told them to teach and that failing that proceedings would be taken against them. Not are we to suppse that the Theological Seminary of our Church teaches that, and afterwards teaches one view only of moot problems? This simply means that Princeton teaches one attitude and defies all others to teach differently. Again I realise that the words were spoken under a good deal of provocation, and that a good many things were said four years ago that do not mean very much.

The Presbyterian Church is a big Church, not a sect, and it does seem to me that its Seminary ought to be a big institution, big enough to hold all views consistent with Evangelical faith.

Very sincerely Francis James Malzard

Rev. David S. Clark, D. D.
2438 North 19th Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Feb. 25. 1928

My dear Dr. Robinson:-

I received and read your pamphlet on Princeton Seminary. It is the best thing that has been written on the subject, sane and generous. Now I want to ask what distribution of this pamphlet has been made or will be made. It ought to go into the hands of every minister in the church and especially to delegates to the assembly. I would be willing to give a little for its distribution every a little for I have stripped myself to help some schools and colleges.

The last Assembly was fooled. I hope the next one will get its eyes opened. Such men as Pratt Fleming are working "tooth and nail" to get control of Princeton, the most unfit.

Dr Machen and others have made a mistake in saying publicly that Stevenson ought to resign. While it would be a

good thing if he did, the demand publicly expressed creates sympathy for Stevenson. While I am disgusted with Erdman, you did right in saying some complimentary things about him. Your pamphlet is so fair that it ought to get before the whole church and will do more to help Princeton than any amount of denunciation of Stevenson and Erdman

You did a mighty good thing in writing it. now give it wings. I hope you are well and happy but I wish you were in Philada.

Best regards

David S Clark

120 McLennan Ave
Syracuse. N.Y.
Feb 25th.

Dear Dr Robinson:

I am delighted with your fine pamphlet on Princeton Seminary.

Dr Erdman is such a fine type of Christian - and a gentle gentleman. That I resented the treatment he was getting from his opponent. To me, Dr Machen's attitude seemed inexcusable. There was so much of "the flesh and the devil" in it. that really I had scant regard for him.

Your pamphlet has at least given me a new viewpoint of his cares - and trials etc - that I feel better toward him. I do not approve of him yet. but can accord him a more willing charity.

Your article is splendid every way. I am grateful for it. and thank you.

You keep in touch with Potsdam news. So I'll not bore you with state items.

I wonder if you know that Ethel Vance Mosher is an sorrow by the

death of her husband last December. She still lives in Rochester and is prominent in the Federation of Women's Clubs.

You remember I wrote you a few years ago of Dr Keene. He is still here - and does his best. As I could read between the lines of your reply - You can form your opinions the same way in this one.

I hope you and Mrs Robinson and Stuart's family - all are well.

Do you ever come this way? Still live on McLennan Ave - and now have a competent housekeeper to look after things. I am better than for some time, and keep busy - and happy. Life is too short to be otherwise.

Best wishes to all of the House of Robinson -

Yours faithfully

John M. Steele

HARVEY D. HINMAN
ARCHIBALD HOWARD
THOMAS B. KATTELL
ROGER F. CLARK
DANA B. HINMAN

C. ADDISON KEELER
THOMAS H. FOGARTY

HINMAN, HOWARD & KATTELL

BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK

February 25, 1928

W. Courtland Robinson, D. D.
Delhi, N. Y.

My dear Doctor Robinson,

I intended to have written you when I received the pamphlet by "Amicus" some time ago. I read the pamphlet at the time and knew that you were the author of it. It read as you talk. Every page reflected your personality. It is a most splendid presentation of the situation as I have come to know it and is so fair and impartial that it ought to make a very strong impression on the Committee and on everyone who reads it. Let me congratulate you on the manner in which you have handled the issues.

With all good wishes and kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours

HDH*rWB

H. D. Hinman.

JOSEPH LAWRENCE WEAVER
FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
ROCKY FORD, COLORADO

The Rev. Wm Courtland Robinson D.D.,
Delhi N.Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:—

I have read with much interest and profit your pamphlet on Omission Theological Seminary.

I thank you for the systematic way in which you have presented it.

I think your treatment of the subject is most fair and telling. I can say "amen" to every point you have made.

My wish is that the Assembly might take heed to this.

I have frequently been a Commissioner and many more times a visitor and listener but I would be glad if it was my "turn" to go to Tulsa.

But the little I can do, to encourage you, and those who think as you do, I will do.

Sincerely
J. L. Weaver

Junction City, Kansas.
March 1, 1928.

Dr. W. C. Robinson:

Dear Brother:--Some one sent me Dr. Vasnel's pamphlet which I read with much interest and acknowledged. Today I received your contribution to the issue and have read it with much concern. I was a United Presbyterian minister for ten years and have been a Presbyterian minister for forty years. The two publications ought to bring a decisive majority in the Assembly. I fear that the majority will destroy Princeton at least as it now is. Dr. Thompson hates Professor Machen and is set on ousting him and the only way is to change the administration into a Board of Trustees that will put him out. Propose to him that the Seminary return to the Board of Directors as constituted now and watch his ire rise at the suggestion. The purpose of the Union and his liberal associates is to destroy the soundness of Princeton. The liberals and the pacifists will unite in putting this program through the Assembly. I have always admired Dr. Erdman since I was under him at a Grove City Bible Conference years ago and have been disappointed with his sanction of Satanism. I have never cared for Dr. Stevenson and now have lost respect for him. A Sabbath School friend asked me the other day how I

accounted for Unitarians. I replied--because of the Devil. Later I wrote a letter in explanation of this harsh judgment referring to the tares of the 13th of Matthew. The Devil is trying to ruin Princeton and the truth it proclaims and is using its President and others in getting his way. The victory will be temporary. Thank you for writing as you have done and for sending me your pamphlet.

A. W. Marshall.

Au Sable Forks, N.Y., Feb. 29, 1928.

Rev. W. C. Robinson, D.D.,

Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Brother:-

I have received and read your recent pamphlet on the situation at Princeton and desire to say that it is the best statement of the situation I have read, and I have read almost all that has been written on the subject from the standpoint of a "Con--servative". If you have not already done so, I wish you would put it into the hands of every member of our (Champlain) Presbytery. I am an alumnus of Princeton Seminary (class of 1885), and feel as you do regarding the present situation, and resent the attitude of the opponents of Dr. Machen and Dr. Allis, although you may not. Yet your spirit in the whole matter, as revealed in your pamphlet, is admirable.

Personally I want to thank you for it, and trust it will have a wide circulation before the next meeting of the General Assembly.

Princeton has maintained the only ~~true~~ position that a school of Theology in our denomination has a right to hold, and I should consider it a crushing blow to our Church if the policy of the President, Dr. Stevenson, and his sympathizers should prevail.

In any event nothing can legally be done, as you maintain, at the coming meeting of the General Assembly, without the unanimous consent of the commissioners. I certainly desire peace within our bounds, but not at the expense of truth.

You probably do not remember me, but when I was pastor of the Presbyterian church of Unadilla I remember your coming before the Presbytery of Otsego for licensure, unless I am greatly mistaken.

I was Stated Clerk of that body for three years, from the time of my election until the dissolution of my relation with the Unadilla ch. where I labored for eight years. Of course I knew your father well, and Mr. Seeley, Richards of Stamford and others.

I have often thought that you now hold a unique position in the church where your father served so long, and to my mind it is an ideal situation, - to go back home and finish out the latter part of your life and work where you began.

I am sure you are, and will be, under the Father's care and will receive the due reward of your labors. With best wishes, and hoping I may in some way be useful to the dear old Seminary, I am,

Cordially Yours,

C. Edward Day

I take the Presbyterian and we enjoy your notes on the International Uniform S. S. lessons. I am not at present in the regular pastorate but preached steadily for 40 years.

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
WILLIAMSPORT, PA.
DAVID DEFOREST BURRELL, MINISTER

February 29, 1928

Rev. Courtland Robinson, D.D.,
Delhi, New York.

My dear Dr. Robinson:

My suspicion is that the meeting on March 9 is called to offer our group a compromise. I can think of no other adequate reason for calling such a conference. If I am right, we are in danger of weakening our position through the willingness of two or three of our men to accept a compromise. I am thinking particularly of men of a political cast of mind like Dr. Laird and Dr. Warfield. From my point of view nothing would be so ruinous to the cause of Princeton Seminary as for us to yield in such a fashion. If I am right in thinking they expect to offer us a compromise, then there is only one conclusion to draw, which is that they know that the tide of sympathy in the church is swinging our way. Of that I have no doubt, from what I have heard and observed. Your own pamphlet, which I have read several times with deep interest and pleasure, has had a great deal to do with the turning of the tide. But now that things are coming our way and there is a chance that the coming Assembly will not approve the reorganization plan, it seems to me that the worst thing we could possibly do would be to yield anything. Further, the one thing that will strengthen the backbone of some of our men is the immediate publication of our Brief. It ought to be issued at once, even if the first issue covers only a part of the church. I think it would be a calamity to delay it. Won't you, if you agree with me, urge its immediate production?

With warm regards.

Faithfully yours,

David DeForest Burrell

East--502--23rd Ave.
Spokane, Washington,
February 28, 1928.

The Rev. Wm. Courtland Robinson, D.D.
Delhi. New York.

My Dear Sir & Brother:-

As an alumnus,--(1877) and the son of an Alumnus (1848), I am profoundly interested in "Princeton Seminary and its Troubles". and therefore highly appreciate your sending me your pamphlet with that title. It is not my purpose to discuss your paper in detail; but it strongly impressed me by its clearness, its calm judicial attitude,--its absolute impartiality;--the fairness and justice, as well as accuracy of its analysis and charaterization of the individual principal participants;--the absence of all acrimony;--all precluding the possibility of any offense being taken by any on either side. It is the best, clearest, fairest presentation of the case that I have seen. One in the Grand-stand can better observe the game and form juster Opinions and judgments, than the members of the teams involved in the arena. It is really hard for me to suppress the impulse to say---very much more; but it would be neither wise, nor fair, nor kind, nor just for oneso far away, and so imperfectly informed as to details, to do so. I can only from the side-lines watch the progress of the conflict, with the mingled feelings of anxiety, fear, and hope, with which one watches by the bedside of a loved mother (alma mater) in a serious illness, the outcome of which is uncertain,--just waiting, praying, hoping, trusting. Ps.37:7. Rom 8:24,25 Isa.26:3 + Phil.4:6,7- Ps.37:5 to 9.

The case has now become so complicated! Were it only a question of doctrinal soundness, of loyalty to our Standards, and to our ordination vows, solution were more simple. Even the differences in administrative policy were not difficult of adjustment. BUT personalities have entered into it,--extending not only to members of the Faculty and Directorate, but even to the Assembly's Committees, and the Church Papers. This is more than unfortunate, it is pitiable, and one cannot suppress a blush that our soiled linen has thus to be paraded before the unsympathetic,--the hostile?--PUBLIC. It seems to have reached thepoint where Psalm 62;5. best voices our thought:--"My soul, wait thou ONLY upon GOD!

for my expectation is from HIM". Oh! for a "daysman to lay his hand upon both"parties, and affect a cordial reconciliation; which accomplished, the other factors would soon and easily be resolved. To use a figure which for long has been a fancy with me;---It is a familiar geometrical fact that if the radii of a circle are shortened, all the points on the circumference are not only drawn closer to the center, but closer to EACH OTHER. Regarding all such groups as Christo-centric "circles"; shall not our prayers and efforts be directed toward drawing all concerned closer to "The Lord we Love"?--this in itself drawing all closer to each other; till all are knit into an unbroken mass,--perfecting the "unity of The Spirit in the bond of peace".---and LOVE. Perfect understanding supplanting the present pitiful and unfortunate misunderstandings? Shall we not further just now unite in concerted prayer throughout the Church for the PRESBYTERIES, that The Great Head of the Church may control and determine the selection of Commissioners to the coming General Assembly, and furnish them with "wisdom from on High" and steadiness in their deliberations, and direct their decisions;--not for the "saving of PRINCETON" for its own sake,--nor ours,--but that it may maintain its historic position as"the pillar and ground of the TRUTH" for the greater glory of Our Lord,--Jesus Christ,--in the salvation of souls, and the edifyiing of the saints. My!! How poorly my brakes work!! I should have Uncle Henry's "four wheel-brakes" in such a case!!

May God bless you, Brother, and follow your pamphlet with His blessing, using it as you desire, for the clarifying of the issues and the allaying of all this fever and irritation. Psalm 133.

As for myself, I am "such an one as Paul the aged" (74) "A Prisoner of The Lord", "H.R" and barred from all activities (save such as I am permitted to render by my---type-writer) by reason of "my often infirmities", Asthma, and"Sciatic Neuritis"; ---"on the side lines"--able yet however to "root",-for THE TRUTH and its defenders. Remember,--"RIGHT is RIGHT, since GOD is GOD. And RIGHT the day MUST win. To doubt would be disloyalty. To falter would be SIN". Yours in Rev. 22;9.

Wm. G. Reid
Min. G.A. 1927- Page 400.

REV. JAMES W. KIRK, D. D.
710 SUSQUEHANNA AVENUE
WEST PITTSTON, PA.

2/28/28

Dear Robinson:

Have just read your pamphlet on Princeton. Let me say that you have done the Seminary and the Presby'n Church a great service. This is the best and most convincing of anything I have yet seen. How I wish your view of the situation could be read by all our Ministers and Elders.

I have been greatly impressed by your comprehension of the whole situation - your fairness to all parties - so impartial, so thorough, so courageous.

Your co-presbyter Dr. Hanna was my Successor at Lexington Ch. Balto. - I for 17 yrs. - he 21.

Fraternally & cordially yours,
James Hollister Kirk
Class of 1875.

"The Manse", POLK, Pa.,
February 28th, 1928.

Dear "Court":

AMICUS is O.K. I read every word of your able and timely pamphlet on the heart-rending situation at dear old Princeton Sem.; and I am taking 'time out' to voice my appreciation of the splendid service you have rendered the cause so dear to the hearts of the real friends of Princeton Theology. Your suggested solution of the difficulty, if only adopted, would surely heal in time and avoid disaster. I have all along been entirely in sympathy with your view of the whole matter.

Since seeing you last at Stony Brook, I have served the Church in Canada for 18 months, until conditions improved sufficiently to let me return in time to save my interests in the Pension Fund. I came here partly on account of our son's residence at Oil City; but he has already accepted a better post in a college in W.Va., at Montgomery, as Coach and Physical Director: that meant a 400 miles trip by auto to be with the family at Christmas. My work on the side here at the State Institution Chapel Services is very interesting: imagine the problem of getting the Gospel across to some 2300 "feeble-minded" folks, with an average mentality of seven or eight years of age. What a privilege and yet what a responsibility ! My long experience in S.S. Missionary work is a great help, and there is every evidence that I am succeeding in this at the Chapel Services. What with this and my three churches, two of them rural, I am busy: it is a happy let-down gradually from my itineraries over larger territory. Did not candidate, just took what the Presbytery's Committee gave me: what does it matter

anyway, when one is usefully occupied all the time, evidently in the place He assigns in His providence Who has called us and SENDS us ?

Hobart is happy with Schofield: He took care of that too: S. is a live wire: I wrote my approval of his circular letter.

Hope all goes well with you and yours in every way. Of course, I get the Presbyterian and can in a sense have a one-sided fellowship with you in the S.S. column; but am longing for another Class Reunion, where it will be face to face. The 40th in '31: well, we hope things will have settled down into blessed peace once more on the old campus, by that time.

As ever and always yours in Him and for His,

John K. MacGillivray

PS My brother was Moderator of the Canadian General Assembly a year ago - Now his successor has fallen in the harvest and I will be acting Moderator until June.

SENECA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
"NUMBER NINE"
R. D. STANLEY, N. Y.

WALTER V. WATSON, MINISTER

JUST OFF THE PENN YAN HIGHWAY FIVE MILES FROM GENEVA.

February 28, 1928

The Rev. W. Courtland Robinson D.D.
Delhi. New York.

My dear brother:

The pamphlet on Princeton Seminary came yesterday and gladdened my heart because of its very evident spirit of sympathy and understanding. It seems certain that much has been done by this brochure to let in the light on the situation - and it is my feeling that if all the ministers of the church could and would read it the dual control of the seminary would stand.

The cumulative force of your appeal shows masterly handling. I wish we had some leading ministers in Geneva Presbytery of your understanding, sympathy, and ability.

Fraternally yours.

Walter V. Watson

EDWIN J. REINKÉ
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, PA.

Feb. 27th, 1928.

Dear Dr Robinson;

Let me thank you for the copy of "Princeton Theological Seminary" you sent me. It deserves the widest circulation, and should be printed, if possible, in the Presbyterian. I regard it as in many respects the best thing I have seen yet in the discussion — irenical, detached, impersonal, while things are yet brought out which make it as clear as daylight that the proposed action is cutthroatism pure and simple. It looks as though God might use it to answer the prayers of the friends of evangelical religion. I think you see clearly as to the effect of the sacrificing of the institution — there will inevitably be a cleavage, and may be a split.

As to Lincoln, it looks at this writing as though the men —

who stood by Dr. Rendall and the Board were going to be sacrificed. It will at least have to be reported to the Assembly, for we are all in the Seminary. If nothing else is possible, I hope that at least reasonable time will be given for adjustments.

Yours very sincerely,

Erwin J. Reinke.

209 East Broadway
Port Jefferson L.I. N.Y.
Feb. 27 1928

W. Courtland Robinson

Dear Brother:

I thank you heartily for sending me your pamphlet on the trouble in Princeton Theological Seminary. It answers my desire to know what the trouble was which till your pamphlet came I could not find out, not even from Prof. Machen's pamphlet. It seems to me that you are fair and that the status quo of the seminary

should remain as it has so long been. I want to see the effort which is being made to change it defeated. I am not an alumnus of the Princeton Theological Seminary but of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick N.J. I am a conservative or if you please a fundamentalist. I am now H.R. My name heads the roll of Long Island Presbytery. Again thanking you I am Yours Cordially

Frederick E. Allen.

CHAS. E. RIEMAN
PRESIDENT

HERBERT HARLAN, M. D.
EXECUTIVE SURGEON

Presbyterian
Eye, Ear and Throat Charity Hospital
1017 EAST BALTIMORE STREET
BALTIMORE, MD.

Balto. March 1-28.

Rev. Dr. H. C. Robinson,

Dear Sir,

Thanks you very much for your recent pamphlet. It seems to me to show a wonderful grasp on the situation, and seems to me to be completely convincing. I am sure the pamphlet will do a great deal of good.

I saw the Balto. Gen. Assembly. Nothing was plainer than that things were being very cleverly manipulated; It is very evident that the manipulation has continued ever since.

The whole modernistic position is evidently the outgrowth of German rationalism. I am hoping that many will leave the unsound positions in the course of time.

The machinery of our presbytery seems to be under modernistic control, but I doubt whether they have a majority

I certainly hope the Lord will keep Princeton Seminary intact, but times certainly are critical and uncertain.

I recently heard Fosdick say over the radio "Sensible and intelligent people no longer pay any attention to creeds at all" He ought to get another D.D. from Princeton University for that. It seems to me his great attraction is a beautiful voice. His thinking is terrible.

I think Dr. Machen's pamphlet and yours will do much good, and may go a long distance in saving the Seminary. Turning on the light breaks up many a crooked scheme, and there are some schemers in our church, and they get to the Gen. Assem.

May the Lord give you and your collaborators strength, courage and success.

Sincerely yours

Rutledge W. Hazeltine

2615 Oswego Ave.

Balto. Md.

We have not heard of the Chester overture down here yet.

Nunda,N.Y.

March 1,1928

Rev W.Courtland Robinson,D.D.,

Delhi,N.Y.,

Dear Dr.Robinson:

I can not refrain from writing you of my pleasure with the fine wonderful treatmant you have given of the Princeton matter in your recent pamphlet. The spirit you have shown in the discussion is superb. The manner is most thorough. The view-point is judicial and impartial. One can see that the whole has been steeped in prayer.

I sincerely believe that you have made a real contribution toward the solution of this vexed and vexatious matter,and that your pamphlet will aid materially in bringing the facts and the "slants" of the subject to the fair and final disposition of it all.

I am among those who look with grave suspicion on the experiment of changing the present governing plan of the Seminary. Those now desiring such change.are doubtless sincere,and entertain intelligent hopes that such change would result in the greater usefulness of the Seminary; but I agree with you most heartily in believing that,it would but open the sluice way of modernization that would eventually and even speedily alter the historic and consistent testimony of Princeton to The Authoritative Revelation from God. Religion without Revelation would soon fling her banner to the breezes,along side the banner of the Cross.

I shall preserve your pamphlet,and should I be elected a commissioner from Rochester Presbytery,shall expect it to be a great help in reaching wise conclusions at the Assembly.

Personally,let me thank you again and again for the pains you have taken to write so satisfactorily on this very important subject. The Master bless you for it.

Fraternally and cordially,

Joel C.Glover.

Joel C. Glover

Pierpont S.D.Feb.28th 1928.

Rev.W.Courtland Robinson,

Delhi,N.Y.

Dear Bro.

I have just finished reading your pamphlet on"Princeton Theological Seminary" and I want to express my appreciation to you for the service I believe you have rendered in sending it out. It is so fair throughout and there is such absence of heat that it should prove of great value in the present controversy.

While I am a graduate of McCormick,I am very much interested in Princeton for I believe it stands for truth that should be dear to every true Presbyterian.Could I have an influence with young men looking ahead to the ministry I would point them to Princeton.

Praying that this splendid seminary may be preserved for conservative Presbyterianism, I remain

Fraternally Yours,

J.W.Christianson

Oregon, Missouri
March 1, 1928.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

After reading your pamphlet on "Princeton Theological Seminary," yesterday, I felt as though I wanted to write you a little note to tell you how much I appreciated the kindly spirit in which you approached every phase of the question involving the discussions concerning Princeton. You give the salient points of the issue and show so clearly that there is no need of reorganization of the plan of management of the Seminary in order to make it more efficient than it has been in the past.

I do wish that your calm

presentation of the real questions at issue may do much to help stem the tide which seems to be setting in so strongly against the plain and simple interpretation of the Scriptures. I very much fear that there is a "Master mind" behind all this propaganda for change with whom the church is not reasoning, even "An enemy who hath done this." Mat. 13:28.

Thanking you for sending me a copy of your very able & considerate paper.

I am

Yours truly,

Thos. E. Roberts

Avoca N.Y.

March 2 1928

My dear Dr. Robinson:-

Thank you for your reply. It merely confirms my opinion that the "Princeton case " is a family row and that we had better let it alone.

There is just one exception I would take to your reply. I do not think it is a matter of "putting out" Dr. Machen. I have never heard any objection to him as Assistant Professor of New Testament language and litarature. His "Elementary Greek for beginners" is used in a good many theological schools where his views on theology are not taken. But as Professor of Apologetics.....Ah! Sir! that is another matter.

Perhaps the solution is for Princeton to get clear of the Church, as Union has done; and thus be enabled to teach her own brand of theology without let or hindrance. As long as she remains "The Theologi Seminary of the Presbyterian Church" the Church will naturally have something to say about her faculty.

Certainly there can be no doubt that it is well that someone should defend the more conservative view of Theology in these days. One is apt to get bewildered by the number of things that seemed fundamental and that are no longer considered so in certain quarters. But is this not a reason why this teaching should be done "reverently, discreetly and in the fear of God" An indiscreet theologian is somewhat of a menace. And yet there are plenty on the Liberal side whose discretion is open to question. But they do not teach in "The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church"

More things are wrought by prayer than the world dreams of. Perhaps this is all God's way of causing the light to shine. There is more light than any one man can refelct, and the man who has a ray of light to cast must not be hindered from casting it. But he must be full of the Spirit of God, whose fruits are joy, peace, loving-kindness, goodwill, etc. I am not quite sure that Dr. Machen has given a brilliant display of these frui

Fraternally

F. J. Malgren

VALATIE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
REV. ROBERT C. HALLOCK, D. D.
VALATIE, N. Y.

March 1, 1928.

Rev. Wm. Bullock Robinson, D.D.,
Malin, Norfolk.

My dear Doctor Robinson:

This note is written in bed, where for 15 days I have been hibernating during and following an attack of "devil's grip," as our doctor names it—, with force rather than elegance.

Some days ago your "Amicus" Princeton pamphlet came to me, and I read it—as carefully and fully as my sickness would permit.

Allow me to say to you that it is the sweetest, finest, fairest statement of the case that has been put forth; and I stand with you heart and soul. I was a member of the Facts. Assembly. I have been heart-sick ever since. You, for the first, have put out a proposition which all lovers of Princeton, and of the Truth in Jesus, ought to be able and willing to meet.

One thing which has not been said — probably ought not to be said in print, publicly — is, that our own friend, the late editor of the Presbyterian, in his intense zeal for the purity of the Church did much to provoke a reaction against the Conservative side, by his years-long demand that the more liberal men get out of the Church, go where they

belong (into Congregationalism, Unitarianism, and what not), leaving our "Fundamental" Presbyterian Church undisturbed.

I'm a Fundamentalist — but I know how many really safe and conservative men, who couldn't just wear the straight-jacket, began to revolt in their hearts and say, "Well, this is more than I can subscribe to."

The Extremist always provokes reaction, and from that reaction we are suffering. God grant that dear Old Princeton be not swept over the falls by that back-wash — before level-headed sanity has sway once more!

Personally I thank you for your "Amicus" booklet, and I pray God that He will use it towards the proper settlement of this heart-breaking strife, involving Princeton and our Church!

Most sincerely Yours,

Robert C. Hallock.

South Presbyterian Church
Syracuse, N.Y.

Monday
3/5/28

My dear Robinson:

I want to congratulate you on the splendid presentation of the Princeton situation in your recent pamphlet. I don't see how it could be put in a better light.

I was down at Princeton visiting my sister & her new husband, Mr. Martin with whom I could not discuss the matter, as you can see. But I spent an evening at Craig's and we

has a great pow-pow.
This last issue of the Presbyterian
is wonderful!

Lt. Reese, one of my Elders
was with me, & I gave him
your pamphlet. He enjoyed it greatly.

But only a very few of my
people take "the Presbyterian",
after much Effort on my part,
and very few of the Session
Even know what it is all about.
Now that I have been here 5 years
I can locate the influence that may
have blanketed the "Presbyterian"
campaigns. You know the situation
in this Presbytery.

With best regards, I am, as ever

Reave

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
REV. SAMUEL C. HODGE, PASTOR
317 WEST MINER STREET
WEST CHESTER, PA.

March 2, 28

Dear Court,

Your pamphlet on Princeton is the finest thing yet. I want to congratulate you on your spirit of fairness — no personalities yet a clean clear statement of the situation. I hope it is being sent to every minister in the church — It will help amazingly in clarifying the situation and winning the society for Princeton: for that battle must be won and will be —

Ever Cordially yours

Samuel C. Hodge

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
W. CLARENCE WRIGHT, PASTOR
MANSE, 213 BROAD STREET
MOUNT HOLLY, N. J.

March 6, 1927

The Rev. W. C. Robinson, D.D.
Delhi, New York

Dear Sir:

Your recent booklet on the Princeton situation has been received. Permit me to say that it is the finest presentation of the matter which I have seen.

As the matter again comes before Monmouth Presbytery next month, and as the election of commissioners is to this end, would you tell me how I could get additional copies for the elders of this church and especially one immediately for the representative at Presbytery. He may be sent to General Assembly and I would desire to see him well posted.

Sincerely,

W. Clarence Wright

Wysox, Pa., 2/5/38

W.Courtland Robinson,D.D.
Delhi, N.Y

Dear Dr Robinson,- For two years I have been wondering why someone did not air the Princeton trouble as you have now done in your "Amicus" pamphlet, which does the business better than I would expect. Being retired on account of infirmity I have time to think on these things.

Might I make a suggestion to you which has not yet appeared in the papers,and which,if it appeared over my name would be injured by my obscurity. The friends of Princeton should now start first fighting fire in this way: Since the Board of Directors in the original body,has always functioned without serious fault,and is composed chiefly of trained and proven experts in theology,and since Princeton exists only to train men in knowledge and practice of theology its Managers should continue to be such, and since the ~~trustees~~ Board of Trustees are a creature of the Directors appointed to attend to the non theological work of the seminary and are men mostly not trained to be experts in theology, if a single board policy is adopted that single board should be like the present Board of Trustees. And they should be dealt by as they have dealt by Dr Stevenson, allowed to continue even if not congenial to some interested,so long as nothing deserving punishment is proven or even charged against them. I am sure such a proposition would appeal to many elders who will be too confused or too uninformed to vote confidently on whatever plan is proposed. Our church just now is diseased with laymanitis.

I was present as Commissioner at St Louis when those two laymen, J.Willis Baer and Robert E Speer put over the Interchurch Business. As discussion progressed I fairly sweat with anger.The proponents of that piece of modernism carefully avoided arguing against any of the bewildered men who floundered around trying to head it off. The business was sprung on us without time for deliberation as the modernists try to do every time. Its friends,one after another reiterated that the church was safeguarded because nothing could be put over without approval of Assembly or of its executive committee,and always Assemply was spoken in bold capitals and executive committee in diamond type. I saw that in fact five men, a majority of a majority of the executive committee was given carte blanc,but I thought there must be some law I do not know to restrain them or some of the big men here would see that naked hook.Then Dr.Baer asked permission to introduce one who had no right on the floor and when it was granted he brought Dr.Speer forward for five minutes during which all he did was to threaten us with the Holy Ghost, that the party would turn down Princeton's enemies have been setting and winning with such traps for two years. Its friends should backfire against such tactics. As Dr McLennan's minority report won out, so you friends of Princeton I think stand best chances of winning out by not risking all on defeating a one Board Plan,but while moderately opposing it with such suggestions as concludes your pamphlet,meanwhile confront the eldership particularly,and the ministers, with the proposition I make above,and if possible have a minority report embodying it,and if you cannot get that,then propose such amendment on the floor.Presbyterians like to amend reports.And elders can appreciate the reasons for continuing the present directors.If the fight continues till '39 as it seems it must I feel confident you can win out along some such line.

E.C.Musselman

E.C.Musselman

The Manse

South Salem
Ohio

Thursday, March 5/25

Rev. H. Courtland Robinson
Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Sir and Brother:

I thank you for the pamphlet "Princeton Sem." which bears your name on its front.

While it gives a comprehensive statement of facts, mentioning names only when necessary, it also calmly + judicially discusses their present significance and with commendable restraint sets forth in sober words the clear, logical result of perversion, distortion or concealing the facts; and the inescapable "indirectness" of the proposal of single board of control.

I have now yet been able to get a candid + complete statement from a "Modernist" bottom on any vital theological truth. Fosdick in his sermon "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" "spilled the beans."

There are four ministers in this Presbytery to whom I would like to have read your pamphlet. Has it been mailed to every minister? If so, no reply is desired. You are too busy. Hope you will be a commissioner to G.A.

Gratefully
B. F. Neville

TELEPHONE
LONGFELLOW 3778

Personal

SYNOD OF MICHIGAN

REV. WILLIAM BRYANT, D. D.
STATED CLERK AND TREASURER
209 W. BUENA VISTA AVE.
HIGHLAND, PARK, MICH.

March 8th.,1928. 192

Rev. William Courtland Robinson,D.D.,
Delhi,N.Y.,

Dear Dr. Robinson,

You do not know me. Of course I know you through your S.S. lessons in the Presbyterian.I knew something about you before that through my old friend,George Ainslie,who was born at Meredith,near Delhi.He always loved to talk about Delhi. The contacts of life are very curious. Dr.W.O.Tompson and Dr. George Luccock and I were all in Iowa,as pastors at the same time.I was at Marshalltown. So I have a good deal of personal interest in that committee,and confidence in their perfect fairness.

Yesterday evening I had a little leisure and sat down quietly to read and study and write my comments on the booklet you were kind enough to send me. I wish it had been issued before, or rather in place of, the pamphlet by Prof. Machen. I do not know Prof. Machen. I never heard him speak but once, that was in the G.A. at Grand Rapids. I did not know who he was until some neighbor told me. I frankly confessed that he aroused my antipathy,not by what he said,but by the spirit of his address.I am sorry to be prejudiced against any man before knowing him personally. I was,in this case. I may say incidentally that the G.R.Assembly was the 12th. that I had been privileged to attend,and I never want to attend another.I have been for 48 years a pastor in the Presbyterian Church,with nothing but happy experiences,and Ihate controversy. I began to write for the Presbyterian the year I was ordained, 1879, by Troy Presbytery. Dr. Matthew B.Grier was then the beloved editor.I helped to elect his successor,Dr. Mutchmore as Moderator in '94. I knew all of the editors that followed.But I have kept free from controversy.

I must say that your pamphlet is the most logical,the fairest and the most Christian that I have read on the Princeton issue. Naturally I have known a good deal about it.I have had long talks with my good friends,Drs. Wallace Radcliffe and Minot C.Morgan,always with the realization that they had no thought but to serve the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is impossible for us all to think alike.It would be an unprogressive world and an unprogressive church in such an attitude. There are men in our Presbytery,(Detroit) that differ widely in their views, but we are singularly free from bitterness. You may have noticed that Detroit Presbytery voted by a big majority not to concur in the Chester overture. Possibly four votes were against this action. Among those who voted not to concur were men as conservative in their views as I am.

I have not visited Princeton much of late years,as I did when my son, Dr. George W.Bryant was there.Now I have a grandson in the college.He was also a graduate of Lawrenceville. I do not know what he has in view for the days to come.But I should hesitate very much to recommend him to attend the Seminary under present conditions.

I have not lost my faith in God's leadership,but I see nothing very hopeful in the future of Princeton Seminary,no matter how G.A. may deal with the Committee's report.I started simply intending to tell you how I appreciate your pamphlet.I have traveled in some varying tracks since I started.

With very kind personall regards,

Yours very truly, William Bryant.

Worcester, N.Y.
3/7/28

Rev. W. C. Robinson D.D.
Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson -

I wonder if I may write to you as a sort of legal adviser in the matter of the Service Pension Plan as it pertains to me personally? I must confess to being quite a bit of an ignoramus

in such matters and felt sure you could and would advise me.

I have been in the Instrumentation Dept for some time but am worried about what this "forfeiture of prior service" after 1. 1. 1928 may mean, as here at Worcester we are still out.

I was very glad to get

your pamphlet on the Principal matter. I thank you for its masterly presentation of the whole subject. I wish it might be placed in the hands of every minister in the Church. I can see no reason to it as yet in the Presbyterian.

Yours sincerely

John C. Rankin

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
ROBERT S. SIDEBOTHAM, PASTOR
136 SOUTH MONROE ST.
TIFFIN, OHIO

March 7, 1928.

The Rev. W.C.Robinson D.D.,
Delhi, New York.

Dear Dr. Robinson,-

It has been a pleasure to read your recent pamphlet on Princeton Seminary. Along with Pres. Stevenson's recent paper, it is the clearest and fairest statement I have read on the subject. Whether one agrees with some of your conclusions, or not, no one can fail to see your real desire to be fair. And as you say, probably no one is entirely unbiased.

May I suggest a few thots of my own - thots not entirely in accord with yours?

Whatever some may say (and I do not find the Committee suggesting it), the One Board Plan should not abolish either Board, but both. The two should be merged, and new blood injected. Certainly the new Board should represent both of the present Boards, and both schools of thot.

As to your comments about Dr, Machen - I believe the Directors made a serious mistake in transferring him to the new department; and I hope the Assembly will finally veto the election. His place is in his present department. But it seems to me that he is not the man for the chair of Apologetics. This with no disrespect for Dr. Machen, under whom I studied, and in whose room I played many a game of checkers.

I believe firmly in One Board Control, but I have never felt that it will solve Princeton's trouble. I want to see it adopted, for it seems to me to be the best possible opportunity for getting at the real trouble. But the settlement will come when both sides agree that each has a right to its views, and that each has a right in the Seminary.

Whether the new plan can be adopted in 1928 is a legal question, and only lawyers can judge. But for either side to threaten court action, or to leave the Church, if the other side gains the day - that is a sad commentary on the lack of the spirit of fair play, and a lack of the Spirit of Jesus.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
ROBERT S. SIDEBOTHAM, PASTOR
136 SOUTH MONROE ST.
TIFFIN, OHIO

What I believe is the real trouble I can best explain from our experience. I graduated in 1909. The class room teaching of some of the professors cast grave doubts on the Christianity of those who held different theological or critical views. I hear this denied. But it was true in my day. And that spirit is abroad in the Church. But on many things the Church is divided, and both sides have a right to their own views, and both have a right to a place in the Seminary. And the plea that Princeton must be held for one view seems to me to totally misunderstand our Constitution.

So while the present issue is administrative, I agree with those who think the real trouble is theological. I signed the Auburn Affirmation, and would do it again - a protest against the un-constitutional proceedure of the Assembly. But I am a conservative. I believe in the Bible as God's inspired Word; the Virgin Birth; the Miracles; the fact that Christ diedin my place; his bodily resurrection. I think that makes me a conservative. But I have liberal friends who do not agree with all my shades of views, and they are fully Christian. I am not speaking of what some call Modernism. And while I hope Princeton will never be Modernistic(I think such should leave our Church); I do believe that Princeton should treat Conservative and Liberal ~~alke~~ alike, and do what it did not do in my day - treat the Liberal as tho he were a Christian.

So I hope the report of the Committee will be adopted for a One Board Control. It will give an opportunity for solving the difficulty. The present control seems to me to have a mistaken view of its task. I hope the report is adopted; but if not, well and good; let's be Presbyterian, and play the game.

I appreciate your fair presentation, even tho I do not agree with some of your conclusions. If all the Directors, Trustees and Faculty had your fair spirit I believe there would be no difficulty.

May God guide the 1928 Assembly - guide to the right conclusion, whether it be my way, your way, or neither.

Sincerely, Robert S. Sidebotham

REV. R. HILLIARD GAGE, D. D., CHAIRMAN
WENONAH, N. J.

MR. W. P. STEVENSON, TREASURER
ROSELLE, N. J.

Presbyterian National Missions in Synod of New Jersey

PHONE 689-W

REV. JOSEPH LYONS EWING, D. D.
SECRETARY AND SUPERINTENDENT
132 BRYANT STREET
RAHWAY, N. J.

March 7 1928

Rev.W.Courtland Robinson,D.D.
Delhi,N.Y.

My dear Dr.Robinson:-

Yesterday,I made time to read your pamphlet on Princeton through to the end. I regard it as many leaps ahead of anything else I have found on the subject. It certainly will touch the spot,if men will but read it. I sat at a dinner at the speaker's table the other night,beside two liberals,One of them said,"That article of Robinson's is the best thing on the other side I have seen yet". The other fellow said,"Uh,I shot it into the waste basket as soon as I saw what is was about".

This same chap who draws a salary twice whay he is worth,put up an engenious argument to prove that McCartney,Alexander,Hutchinson, McEwan,et al are responsible xxxxxfor the industrial difficulties in the Pittsburg region. In other words,if ever we are to have social and industrial peace and prosperity we have got to xxxxxx strangle the Fundamentalists,and by George we're going to do it!

Can you beat it? I wish you would send copies of the pamphlet even though they may come duplicate,to the following-

Rev.J.M.Ewing,Ambler,Pa(My son,just installed there)
R.H.Gage,Wenonah,N.J.
Wm.T.Hanzsche,247 Spring St,Trenton,
James T.Eiken,Bridgeton,N.J.
Jos.E.Curry,Cranbury,N.J.

Cordially,

Joseph Lyons Ewing

Do not takexx time to answer this letter.

MINNESOTA SOLDIERS' HOME

MINNEAPOLIS
MINNESOTA

HEADQUARTERS PHONE DREXEL 0912

OFFICERS
S. H. TOWLER, - - COMMANDANT
RESIDENCE PHONE DREXEL 4271
BYRON J. MOSIER, - ADJUTANT
WM. R. BOYCE, - QUARTERMASTER
T. C. CLARK, M. D. - - SURGEON
REV. GEO. B. SMITH - CHAPLAIN

TRUSTEES
R. H. JEFFERSON, PRESIDENT
BINGHAM LAKE
HARRISON A. READ, VICE PRES. - WASECA
R. D. O'BRIEN - - - ST. PAUL
S. R. VAN SANT - - - MINNEAPOLIS
C. M. WILSON - - - - DULUTH
FRED SEEBACH - - - RED WING
ANDREW G. DUNLOP - MINNEAPOLIS
GLEN H. DAVIS, SECRETARY - ST. PAUL

March 8, 1928

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson, D.D.,

Dear Brother: I have received your pamphlet on Princeton. It is so clear and friendly that "Amicus" only could write. It should not receive an adverse criticism by any, and will certainly be helpful in behalf of those "on the fence", to climb down on the right side - keep Princeton as it has been for 116 years and even make it stronger. Your paper will confirm & encourage those of us on the right side. I am a Western Seminary man but had A. A. Hodge for Prof. - was ordained in 1871, am in good health & preach twice each Sabbath & do other pastoral work as chaplain. I hope Dr. Snowden's statement respecting the Assembly of 1927 which, he said, was "ill informed" will be followed by one "better informed" in 1928, will materialize, & your paper should aid much, bring it about. I have some of the same spirit in this matter that I had when I enlisted in 1862 for 3 yrs or during the war. I am in 87th year.

Sincerely Yours Geo. B. Smith

P.S. I know Snowden is on the wrong side.

Saint Cloud, Minn. Nov. 12th 1928.

Rev. W. Cortland Robinson: D.D.

Dear Sir & Brother,

A few days ago a small pamphlet was brought to me by the mail carrier. When I saw the title, I said "What next?" As I read all I find in regard to Princeton Sem. I got onto this last at once. It seemed clear to me, that you are a Director & was pleased with your fairness & ample knowledge of affairs, for I did not fully understand some things, that I had read: though two things seemed clear enough — First, that one man was the root, stem and branches of the whole trouble. Second, that the report of the Committee, sick stupid and was partisan & unfair. And I am still of that conviction.

Your explanation of Dr Thompson is

too generous. There is something in his action, that has not been explained; perhaps, will not be explained. He was here at Synod and made a talk that fell flat. I can not understand why the Assembly took such action, unless, because the business was not understood. The body on the floor was confused & I think the leaders wanted it so. The one-board of control is camouflage = a smoke to hide something. Will we ever find out.? That Committee should have been dismissed for its open contempt of Gen Assembly, and if it repeats its conduct for which it did not offer a word of apology or explanation, the Assembly should refuse to receive the report.

If the Assembly does not support its self respect, there might, just

as well be in Gen Assembly.
We are come to a time when every thing is done on the platform by a few leaders: the great body of Commissioners is a "Rubber-Stamp."
Who heard a voice from that body?
"Parity of the ministry" that is gone. D.D.s and L.L.Do. rule, Dr Stevenson never has been fit for his place. I would like to have a chance to vote to ask him to retire.
I thank you for the pamphlet. It is fierce with information that we did needed. I wonder that you could hold your temper so well as you did, though it snapped just a little sometimes.
Yours fraternally,
E. V. Campbell

GUY D. ALLEN, CHAIRMAN BOARD OF TRUSTEES
4833 HARRIET AVENUE

E. E. CUNNINGHAM, CLERK OF SESSION
3655 BLAISDELL AVENUE

O. M. CORRELL, SUP'T BIBLE SCHOOL
3828 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH

STEWART MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
CORNER STEVENS AVENUE AND THIRTY-SECOND STREET
TELEPHONE, SOUTH 4189

REV. PERRY V. JENNESS, D. D., MINISTER
3209 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
TELEPHONE, SOUTH 2488

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN

March 9, 1928.

Rev. W. Cortland Robinson, D.D.,
Delhi, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Robinson:

I thank you most heartily for the pamphlet on "Princeton Theological Seminary." I have read it thoroughly and deeply sympathize with your presentation of the whole situation.

I am wondering if you have any extra copies of this pamphlet. If so, I would like three or four to put in the hands of some of our elders who need the information it contains. I will gladly send you postage to cover if the pamphlets are available.

Let us hope and pray that the forthcoming General Assembly will handle this matter in a sympathetic and constructive way.

Yours sincerely,

P. V. Jenness

PVJ:B

Administered by
University of Nebraska
DEAN R. LELAND
University Post

My dear Courtland:

Thank you for the statement you make in the pamphlet. I am glad you gave it wider circulation. So far away and out of touch with ~~with~~ Princeton when I have never been able to determine the source of the trouble, perhaps no one will ever fathom the depths of such a mess. The whole affair has been such a disappointment to me, for I have occasion to advise undergraduates studying for the ministry as to the best place for theological training. I have sent several to Princeton. But these recent years I could not conscientiously urge students to enter the old seminary and take a chance of either becoming disgusted or partisan. However sound and scholarly Princeton may be, it is

not a fit place under present conditions for a man to develop mind and heart in preparation for the ministry.

I really didn't mean to say all this. I only wanted to commend you for the spirit in which you wrote your pamphlet, its motive and purpose. It helped me to understand the situation somewhat.

I feel like a man writing a seminary. I still love the old school of the prophets as I know it — when the spirit of such men as Drs Green, Powers, Warfield & Patton — made beautiful the life of the place. I should feel rather forlorn if I should enter the campus now and know that no such spirit is there now.

I shall be glad to hear from you if you have time to write me a line.

With kind remembrances.

Sincerely yours,

Dean A Leland

Westminster House
3332 14th St.

Members of Session
W. M. Hilborn, *Clerk*
Dr. Thomas L. Kane
Franklin E. Ulf
Charles G. Hubbard
C. E. McCluskey
J. Anthony Willman
Robert E. Fees

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

No. 30 Chestnut Street
Manse, No. 33 Pine Avenue

ARTHUR J. MARBET, *Minister*

Members Board of Trustees
Charles S. Clark, *President*
Andrew Skooglund, *Vice President*
Charles Colson, *Secretary*
Franklin E. Ulf, *Treasurer*
Carl H. Tew, *Financial Secretary*
O. H. Johnson

Kane, Pa., March, 17th, 1928.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson, D.D.,
Delhi, N.Y.,

My dear Dr. Robinson:

It is not often that I take the trouble to express my appreciation of material from the press which has met with my most hearty approval. But because the cause of Princeton is to me so momentous, I depart from custom to tell you how much I rejoice in the defense of Princeton as I find it in your pamphlet. The scholarship, the fairness, and the restraint of Princeton are evident throughout. In times when dropsy has fastened itself on the written word, it is good to see truth spare-limbed and cleanly effective. No Princeton lover has occasion to be ashamed of its defenders. It gives me double joy to find the defender of Princeton and the contributor of the Sabbath School Lesson Review in the Presbyterian to be not two but one person. I think that we are all realizing in these days that we have something to live and suffer for. It gives me satisfaction to congratulate you.

Very sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Marbet.

Moosic, Pa.
March 21, 1928.

Ans.

Rev. Wm. Courtland Robinson, D. D.
Delhi, New York,

My dear Robinson:--

Read with much interest some time ago your pamphlet on the Princeton situation. It ought to do much to clarify the issue. But somehow I am looking forward with grave apprehension to the meeting of the Assembly.

Some of us are wondering if there is anything we can do in Presbytery to help Princeton in the present crisis. We can generally depend on about a ninety per-cent conservative vote. Most of that I think can be counted on for the position in the Princeton question which you represent. I am therefore writing to ask if you have any light to give us or any suggestions in the matter.

Would it be wise for us to try to pass the Chester protest? Would it help along? Some of us while in favor of its general purpose feel that it is legitimately open to some criticism and that it does not go far enough. Is there anything that you can propose as a substitute?

Do you think that there will be a definite attempt to push the matter to a final issue at this Assembly? If so and the report of the Committee carries what is likely to be the reaction at Princeton and in the church? It seems to me it might precipitate a crisis the end of which it would be difficult to prophesy.

I shall be glad of any suggestions you can make. Our Presbytery meets the middle of April, we want to have something ready by that time, and to know also what action to take on the Chester protest which is sure to come up.

Mrs. Van Dyke joins me in kind personal greetings. With best wishes and thanking you I am,

Very sincerely yours,

Geo. B. Van Dyke

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
REV. DWIGHT C. HANNA, D.D., PASTOR
GILBERTSVILLE, N. Y.

March 21, 1925

Dear Dr Robinson.

Some time ago I received & read with great appreciation your Princeton pamphlet. I my judgment it was written with rare tact, and cannot help but do good. It cannot antagonize. For this reason I believe it the most effective of all the Princeton pamphlets that have gone out. I thank you.

Is there anything we can do to secure two Princeton votes (from our Presbyter) in Tulsa in May? Your knowledge of men & conditions is better than mine. If it lies in your power to engineer a program of action I am eager to be of any assistance possible.

Surely the Church must be beginning to be aroused, for some of you are doing valient service, & somebody is spending some money. I begin to have hope that the Conservatives will be able to make a successful stand at Tulsa.

Sincerely

Dwight C. Hanna

East--502--23rd Ave.
Spokane, Washington,
March--17th,1928.

The Rev. Wm. C Robinson, D.D.
Delhi, New-York,

My Dear Sir, & Brother:--

I am constrained to annoy you further in a matter in which we are both profoundly interested, while under the necessity of holding a tight rein upon a restive spirit, lest it "get away with me". But Job.32;17--20.

Do you take the BIBLE CHAMPION? I hope that you do. If not, you do not know what you are missing. I take the liberty of sending in this mail a "sample" copy, to let you "taste it". I am not writing, however, to "boost" BIBLE CHAMPION, or (primarily) to increase its subscription list. There may be no need, in your case.

I am free to say, however, that it is full of "fat things full of marrow &c" above any other magazine of its class that has come to my desk in all my long ministry. I am sure that Dr. S. D. Kennedy will underwrite the strongest commendation I could give it.

The Rev. Professor Leander S. Keyser D.D. of Hamma Divinity School at Springfield Ohio is a worthy successor to the late Drs. Wm. H. Bates, (my warm personal friend for many years) and D. J. Burrell. Val. He is a man of extraordinarily wide reading, of profound and sane scholarship, a writer, and a logician of exceptional power. His "BOOK REVIEWS" alone are worth the subscription price of the Magazine.

He is not infallible, however, and in the March 1928 Number, page 174 in discussing "The Case of Princeton Seminary", he is not altogether fair, nor accurate; due, I am sure, to insufficient, or inaccurate information. I know him too well to believe that he would be guilty of intentional injustice.--especially to the disparagement of a Brother.

In reviewing Dr. Machen's pamphlet,-----to the fact that it is (unavoidably) strongly "ex parte", he has not given the consideration which strict, impartial justice demands,------he unintentionally does Dr. Charles R. Erdman an injustice. He does not discriminate between him and President Stevenson; but ties them together as equally responsible for the unfortunate state of affairs.

I do not Know Dr. Stevenson, and hold no brief for his defense. but I do know Dr. Erdman, and feel sure that if Dr. Keyser knew him he would not class them together. Dr. Erdman's (now sainted) father honored me with his invaluable personal friendship; and his son is "beleved for the father's sake" as well as for his own.

Few men, (as you will attest) are more loveable,--more averse to controversy or conflict, Therein is his weakness in this Princeton controversy. He cannot bear to offend, or to hurt the feelings of,---any one. He is a typical "conciliationist" (Matt.5;9) not a "Pacifist" for "peace at any price", or at the sacrifice of principle.

This spirit, and the ~~unavoidable~~, subtle influence of the "atmosphere" of New York, and the close association, which his position makes unavoidable, with the leading spirits of New York "Liberalism", whose slogan is "Toleration", has unconsciously warped him.

This contention for "broad Tolerance", for "inclusiveness",

on the part of Dr. Stevenson, is, as it seems to me, the ROOT of the whole trouble. In this policy, the Directors, and the majority of his associates in the Faculty refused to sustain him. Am I not right?

Dr. Erdman's futile attempt to be neutral; to placate Dr.Stevenson and his backers; his failure to align himself with Dr. Machen, et al, in vigorous, positive, aggressive defense of "The Fundamentals" as against Liberal assaults, open, or insidious, drew from Dr. Machem the expression which so irritated him, and precipitated the personal element, that "so far as any public utterances went, he was an "indifferentist".

Dr. Keyser evidently shares the impression which has recieved wide acceptance, that the issue at Prihceton is DOCTRINAL, between "Fundamentalists"and "Modernists" or "Liberals." This (save as indirectly as noted above) you and I know is not the case.

The parties are not divided on essential doctrinal lines. The essential doctribal soundness of every one of the Faculty and Directorate, is universally conceded without qualification. The New-York crowd have taken advantageof the differences in administrative policy to push their attack upon Princeton's well known Conservatism,--truly,--and those who appear as leaders, are (unwittingly, let us hope) merely the "cat's paws" of the "Liberal", "Modernist" faction.

But---Whoa! there! Steady! my boy! Go slow! You've said enough,--perchance too much. All this is preliminary to a request that, in the interest of justice to Dr. Erdman, and a fair appraisement of the situation, you would kindly send a copy of your pamphlet "PRINCETON SEMINARY & ITS TROUBLES" to Rev.LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D,--1126 North Fountain Ave. SPRINGFIELD, OHIO. with my Compliments.

I have just re-read Dr. Frank H. Stevenson's pamphlet,--"A Pastor Looks at Princeton", That is clear and strong. It will have more weight than Machen's which will be discounted because he is one of the parties,--the chief "bone of contention". Dr. Stevenson's however is still ex parte, he being one of the "majority group of the Directors". Your pamphlet is free from both these disqualifications.

Availing myself of their offer printed on the Foreword, I have asked thepublisher to send a copy of that paper also to Dr. Keyser, for further information. I have written Dr. Keyser that I have done this, asking him to revise his opinion of Dr. Erdman,--correct the impression as to the real difficulty,--in the interest of just appraisement.

I am sorry, but not surprised, at the position of Dr. Snowden, and THE BANNER. THE ADVANCE, of course would be opposed to us. Any Editor, (or paper) which would publish "Heather Heretics" to go into the homes of our Church, and publish with strong endorsement those articles of Dr. Thomas F. Day on the Old Testament,--is"outside the pale."

But, again, I must be careful. Oh, I cannot but believe that The Lord of the Church which He purchased with His own blood, will yet bring us all out of this snarl--rebuking and healing these "bickerings" so greatly to be regretted,---"There should be no strife between -these BRETHREN"! Gen.13:8 For "Right is Right, since God is God; and Right the day MUST win. To doubt would be disloyalty. To falter would be SIN."

Shall we not redouble our prayers,-(1)for the Semihary,-(2)for these conflicting parties,-(3)for thePresbyteries as they choose their Commissioners,-(4)for the Commissioners, that they may be endued with wisdom for a right decision,-(5)for The General Assembly,--and OVER ALL, (6)that in any event, HIS will,--not ours, be accomplished for Princeton,.

OVER

He has more at stake in this than we have. He is much more deeply interested in the outcome than we can possibly be.

Let us then, "commit our way unto Him,---TRUST also in Him,--with all our heart, not leaning to (depending upon) our own understanding," assured that he will ----"ATTEND TO THE MATTER." Thus I 1 like to render the Hebrew.

Thus we would deal with our lawyer in a matter of great moment. As he says,--"Bring me the papers,--Leave them with me. Just TRUST ME, and I will "Attend to the matter. Give yourself no further concern,---I WILL ATTEND TO THE MATTER." Ps. 37; 7. Philip.4; 6,7.

So let us TRUST HIM to care for HIS OWN interests, to protect his own Truth, and his servants of whom it may be truly said, "The zeal of thine House hath eaten me up." "Said I not unto thee that if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God? AMEN.

Sincerely Yours in the Fellowship of His Service.

John Graham Reid

Princeton Seminary, 1877.
G.A Minutes 1927, P.400.

In re-reading the above, I note a number of words and phrases which I should correct upon revision; but I really do not feel (physically or mentally) equal to the task of re-writing the letter. I have little "reserve strength", Even moderate effort, (physical or mental), sustained, or concentrated, tires me. So I shall have to ask you accept it---as it is,--and make allowance; "The spirit is ready; but the flesh is weak".

May I add expression of my high appreciation of your exposition of the Sunday-School Lessons which appear weekly in THE PRESBYTERIAN. "Weekly" they may be; but by no means "weakly." We enjoy them much.

THE FIRST WELLINGTON BANK

ESTABLISHED 1864

MEMBER FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

CAPITAL $ 85,000. SURPLUS $ 100,000.

WELLINGTON, OHIO

CHAS. T. JAMIESON
CASHIER

March 21 1928.

Rev. Courtland Robinson,
Delhi, New York,
Rev. and dear sir:-

My old college classmate, Rev. J. W. Kirk, of West Pittston, Pa.,, has recently written me about the affairs at Princeton in which we are both deeply interested. He is interested as a graduate of the seminary and as a Fundamentalist, and I am interested as an elder and a rock ribbed Fundamentalist and Calvinist.

He tells me that you have issued a pamphlet on the burning question and has asked me to write you for one. This I do with great pleasure. And, as the issuing of pamphlets means an outlay of money I wish to be in on the contributing line. I would be a partner with you in the work of trying to save our Church from the disintegrating blight of Unitarianism which lies at the heart of Modernism.

Wishing all success to those who are fighting to keep our beloved Church on its eternal foundations, the inspired revelation, the complete and unadulterated and whole Word of God, I am

Fraternally yours,

Chas. T. Jamieson

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
ROBERT S. SIDEBOTHAM, PASTOR
136 SOUTH MONROE ST.
TIFFIN, OHIO

March 15, 1928.

The Rev. W.C.Robinson D.D.,
Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson,-

Thank you for your letter from Philadelphia. I know you have much correspondence these days, but I want to at least answer.

I believe, as you say, that differing as we do in many views, you and I could calmly get the matter adjusted in a satisfactory manner. It is too bad that in the heat of conflict men will say things they are sure to be sorry for. Conflict shows our worst.

I wonder if you would agree with my desire? I would like to send your letter on to Dr. Luccock. It contains much that might be of value to him personally, or to the Committee, if you approve. Of course I shall not show it to anyone else unless you approve. I realize it was hastily written, and you might object.

I have talked with Dr. Luccock and I know he wants to be fair. Hence this suggestion.

May I make a suggestion, that is probably not new to you? It is this - cant some of you who are close to him get Craig to let up on his articles? I believe that with his attacks on the integrity of the Committee (a Committee in which the Church has confidence, a group of high minded, if fallible men); and in his threats to leave the Church unless he gets his way, that he is predjudicing the case and is making it impossible for the whole matter to get a fair impartial hearing. I admire Craig, and am sure he is conscientious, but I do believe he is creating an atmosphere that will make the Assembly be sure to adopt the report, whatever it may be.

I believe Dr. Thompson is legally right in saying that the Trustees will have to elect the new Board. That will be so in applying for the new charter. But they ought by blanket vote to agree to elect whoever the Assembly may decide upon. That is no

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
ROBERT S. SIDEBOTHAM, PASTOR
136 SOUTH MONROE ST.
TIFFIN, OHIO

more than fair. And to elect themselves and a few of the directors would be folly. I like the suggestion of a Board of 33, 11 from each and 11 new ones.- all selected by the Assembly, and then legally elected by the Trustees. The men who have been the storm center on either Board ought not to be on the new Board.

And I still hold to the suggestion I made to Dr. Luccock sometime ago, that, waiving the right and wrong of their actions, and without passing judgement on the merits of the case - that for the sake of peace and harmony it might be very wise for both Stevenson and Machen to leave the Seminary.

Dick will not be able to stay long on account of health. Armie is not in the limelight so much that he is making trouble, and he is too valuable to lose. Erdman has not been the center of the fight, but has been drawn in. And the others of the Faculty have been more or less quiet. I personally can see no strength in either Voss or Hodge, think there are both very weak sisters, but others do not agree with me. I wish Warfield was alive. There was a man, a gentleman, the best teacher I ever had, a man capable of seeing the thots and good intentions of those who did not agree with him. In class room, while Dick would fuss and fume, and call Driver and his kindred anything but Christian; Warfield would smile and be a gentleman, while holding very dedi-ded views of his own.

God guide the Assembly. Not to your way or my way, but to His way. And whatever the Assembly does, lets have no law-suits, or withdrawals, or insinuations - but let's play the game. Both sides are honest, and both cant win. Both sides are Christian, and both sides are sincere. God guide the Assembly.

Sincerely,

R. S. Sidebotham

I canvassed Delhi in the summer of 1905 while your father was pastor. Remember several delightful visits with him.

ans

Marcus A. Brownson
Southern Pines
North Carolina

March 22/28

My dear Robinson;

Laid ~~tell~~ me you have written and published the best pamphlet on the Princeton situation which has appeared. Very much want a copy. Can you send me one? —

Also can you tell me the date of the Spring Meeting & our Board of Directors

I am counting on May 7th in making my plans for going North.

I hope I have the date right, and will appreciate a word from you, and the pamphlet. Cordially,

Brownson.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Wilson College
Chambersburg, Pa.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

I have now read your pamphlet, and I commend it heartily. It is fine in form, substance & temper. Thank you for writing it & sending it out.

I went down to utter ruin — knocked down, dragged out, stamped upon, &c, &c, &c, No one stood with me — Judge Fox went home at the end of the first day.

My feeble plaints I enclose.

O for a Luther, a Calvin, a Knox, a Chalmers!

With best wishes

Yours faithfully

E. D. Warfield.

74 MERCER STREET
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

March 26/28

My dear Dr Robinson:

I received a copy of your pamphlet on the Seminary but did not acknowledge it as there was some uncertainty about its authorship. Afterwards I learned that you had issued it in your own name & that in this form it was being sent to the Church. Some of the Faculty received signed copies but I did not. This will account for my further delay.

I think I ought to say that your statement, when I first read it, impressed me as well informed & fundamentally right both in its argument & in its conclusion. Obviously you could not state the whole case & to me at times you seemed in your evident desire to be fair to favor one of the parties to the issue chiefly by omission of pertinent fact. This however does

not change my opinion that the Statement as a whole is sound with conclusion valid.

Perhaps you will permit me also to say that I appreciate your courageous public stand for a cause which though right does not seem at the moment to command popular support in the Church.

With kind regard, believe me,

Very sincerely yours

W. C. Armstrong

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson D.D.
Delhi. N.Y.

Collingswood N.J.
March 31, 1928

Dear Friend:

I want to express my appreciation of the pamphlet on Princeton Seminary.

Its lucidity, fairness and Christian spirit should appeal to all those of our communion who are at all bewildered as to the issues at stake, and I pray may be used to strengthen those who should oppose the unfair and insidious methods used to gain control in the

in the interest of so called "modernism". I prefer to call it "presbyterianism".

It was refreshing also to hear from a valued pastor, one to whom, perhaps, I may have not expressed my deep appreciation before.

We are very happy in our church affiliation here. We have a good minister in Russell Paynter and the Lord has greatly blessed us in sending us Harold Laird.

At our Communion Service today 34 united with us, 20 on confession test of all, out of a membership

of some 800, big partook of Communion.

With the prayer that the Great Head of the Church will guide her out of her present dissension and bring to each member His parting words: "by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" Sam

— Yours cordially and sincerely

John G Macky

PHILADELPHIA CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION

DEPARTMENT OF EXAMINATION

WM. M. HARDT
EXAMINER

April 2, 1928.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson,

Delhi,

New York.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

Please allow me to kindly answer one query in your splendid production of "Princeton Theoligical Seminary" viz;- " Are ministers so untrustworthy?" Answer- Some, yes. Many are unfamilar with matters of material interest, due to preoccupation with spiritual affairs (properly so) Quite a few are woefully impracticable and sentimental, also some meddle in politics, becoming partial and decidedly partisan. Many are too liberal and share their pulpits to actors of unsavory reputations, to the exclusion of pure unadulterated worship; and many other things of a purely spiritual ~~material~~ character. Of course these strictures herein cannot possibly apply to yourself in any manner whatever.

Sincerely yours,

Wm. M. Hardt

PROTEST OF PRINCETON ALUMNI RESIDENT IN THE ORIENT
AGAINST ANY CHANGES IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SEMINARY.*

Whereas the church universal is passing through one of the greatest crises in her history, a crisis which threatens to shake the very foundations of historic Christianity, we cannot but view with alarm any proposal to change the constitution of Princeton Theological Seminary. This Seminary as at present constituted, has been a bulwark of evangelical Christianity for more than a century. The church in America as well as on the mission field has felt the steadying influence of this grand institution of theological learning, therefore it cannot be the part of wisdom, in such a time of doctrinal unrest and conflict, to exchange a plan, which for a century has been tried and proved eminently satisfactory as a means for safeguarding the truth, for a new and untried plan. Such a step is certainly dangerous and may ultimately be disastrous.

Whereas the Faculty and Board of Directors of the Seminary, in whose judgment and knowledge of the facts in the case we have every confidence, have by a large majority expressed their firm conviction "that the proposal to establish a single Board of Control for the Seminary, if made effective, would be fatal to the maintenance of the historic doctrinal position of the Seminary."

We, the undersigned alumni, do hereby make public our protest against any change that would even tend to weaken, or in the least degree endanger the historical doctrinal position of the Seminary, and do hereby earnestly petition the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America at its annual meeting in 1928, not only to refuse to make any changes in the constitution of the Seminary, but to do all in its power to strengthen this institution, that the influence of her sound evangelical scholarship, for which she has been so long and so justly famed, may continue to be felt unto the ends of the earth, to the praise and glory of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Signed † by
Martin A. Hopkins,
G. P. Stevens,
David B. VanDyck,
J. Wallace Moore,
Stacy L. Roberts,
H. N. Park,
Richard H. Baird,
J. Gordon Holdcroft,
J. F. Preston,
L. T. Newland,
W. B. McIlwaine,
Roy M. Allison,
C. E. Scott,
J. W. Lowrie,
H. Conrad Ostrom,
Floyd E. Hamilton,
S. W. Lee,
Wm. M. Baird, Jr.,
Joe B. Livesay,
J. K. Unger,
P. Lee Palmore,
Albert B. Dodd,
D. C. Butler,
F. K. Jowe,
N. Tamura,
C. L. Phillips,
Archibald Campbell,
T. Stanley Soltau,
Wm. B. Hunt,
Robert Knox,
Geo. P. Pierson.

*That Princeton Alumni are not the only Seminary Alumni in the Orient interested in this Protest is indicated by the following letter, written by a McCormick graduate to whom it was sent by mistake, and addressed to one of the most eminent of living missionaries:

Presbyterian Mission
Paotingfu, Chihli, Jan. 27, 1928

Dr. J. Walter Lowrie
Missions Building, Shanghai

Dear Dr. Lowrie:

I should have sent this on to you several days ago. Although I am in entire sympathy with this letter, I can't sign it, as I am not a Princeton man. I went to McCormick. I have canvassed our mission and find that we have no Princeton men (foreigners) at present on the field. Among the Chinese is one Princeton graduate, Mr. F. K. Jowe, and I have secured his signature.

Hoping to see you at Mission Meeting this coming Spring, and with warmest regards from Mrs. Jenness and myself, I am,

Faithfully yours,
RICHARD E. JENNESS.

†Only nine of the signers are from China. Owing to the unsettled conditions in China many of the Princeton Alumni are absent from the country. What is more, some of those still there did not get to see it because of uncertainty as to their present location and the irregularity of communications.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

March 30, 1928

Princeton Defense Committee
1625 Graybar Building
New York City

Dear Sirs and Brethren:

Professor Erdman in his letter of March 19, 1928, says that the differences at Princeton are "not doctrinal" but "personal and administrative." There are here two propositions: first, that the differences are not doctrinal but personal; and secondly, that they are not doctrinal but administrative. I beg leave to differ with him on both propositions.

For what has been the occasion, though not the underlying cause, of the differences at Princeton not only between but within all the Seminary organizations? The occasion of the expression of these differences has been the selection of professors and special speakers. The majority in the Board of Directors and in the Faculty have sought to follow the "general principle" of the Form of Government (Chap. I, sec. 4) that "no opinion can be more pernicious or more absurd than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are" and that "there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty." This is the doctrine which is most under debate to-day not only in Princeton but throughout the Church at large – the doctrine of the importance of doctrine. The Presbyterian Church founded Princeton Seminary and since 1870 has intrusted the Board of Directors with the election of professors, subject to the Assembly's veto. The Board of Directors under the authority given it by the General Assembly has intrusted to the Faculty the choice of speakers to the students.

Why do I say all this? First, in order to testify "as an expert witness" that the line of clash in every committee for the selection of speakers by the Faculty – I belong to every one except that which selects the speaker for the Stone Lectures – has been along the line of doctrine, the doctrine of the importance of doctrine. I have thought that my stand was required by the pledge which I willingly took to "solemnly and ex animo adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church" and "not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate anything which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly or impliedly, anything taught in said Confession of Faith or Catechisms:" Surely this solemn pledge requires that the speakers whom we select from outside to address the students should as far as possible be men who will neither contradict nor contravene either directly or impliedly anything taught in our Confession.

Surely also the Board of Directors are not to be blamed by the General Assembly for attempting to live up to the pledge which each member of the Board, before taking his seat, must subscribe, viz.: "Approving the Plan of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, I solemnly declare and promise, in the presence of God and of this Board, that I will faithfully endeavor to carry into effect all the articles and provisions of said Plan, and to promote the great design of the Seminary." Honor and honesty required that they should carry out the Plan of the Seminary.

The second reason is that the Church may have a correct view of the fairness or capacity of the committee that came here to investigate and never found out "what is the matter with Princeton Seminary," or at least never published it if it did find out. Its report to the last General Assembly was probably proposed and almost certainly adopted under a misapprehension of the facts. How else could the Assembly have adopted a report implying that there are no influences at work "even tending toward departure from the historic position of Princeton Seminary?"

Again we are told that there is "no reason for suspicion" "as to the wisdom of the plan for readjustment" of the Seminary. No reason for suspicion as to a plan that is supported by almost all Modernists in and out of the Presbyterian Church? No reason for suspicion when it has been proposed to turn out all the directors who are opposed to the policy of "inclusiveness"? No reason for suspicion when some of the advocates of the new administration, now officially connected with the Seminary, have proposed to order all the professors to keep silence on matters of controversy?

Lastly we are told that "this is no hour for strife." But the Apostle Paul commands to "strive for the faith of the Gospel." That is just what the majority of the Faculty and Board of Directors at Princeton are trying to do. We are fighting the best fight we can in behalf of the Bible and the Gospel it contains, and striving to keep the Faith. Would that Professor Erdman and those whom he supports would drop their attempts at union with those outside the Presbyterian fold and would join with their natural allies "for united action in proclaiming [and defending] the Gospel message which Princeton has ever taught and which Presbyterians ardently love."

Yours sincerely,

Robert Dick Wilson.

A STATEMENT

Ever since the action of the last General Assembly in adopting the report of Dr. Thompson's Committee there has been a growing concern about Princeton Seminary, not only among its alumni, but among Presbyterians everywhere—a concern by no means confined to Presbyterian circles.

This concern has found expression in a multitude of conversations and private letters, in numerous articles and editorials in the religious press, in pamphlets like those of Drs. W. Courtland Robinson and Frank H. Stevenson, in the petition to be presented to the next General Assembly by the Committee of One Thousand and in the "Protest of Princeton Alumni Resident in the Orient Against Any Changes in the Constitution of the Seminary" (copy enclosed).

In view of the fact that a so-called "group of Conservative Alumni who live near Princeton" has broadcasted a letter by Professor Charles R. Erdman in which he says that the historic position of Princeton Seminary is in no wise endangered; also in view of the further fact that a footnote is attached to said letter in which the petition sponsored by the Committee of One Thousand is characterized as "curiously unbalanced," and such efforts as have been made to inform the Church concerning the Princeton situation referred to as "an attack upon, rather than a defense of, Princeton" and as "a gross misrepresentation of the true situation"—statements which in the absence of any supporting proof is at least suggestive of that "suspicion" and "bitterness" which the letter itself deprecates—it has seemed fitting to the Princeton Defense Committee to request a statement from Professor Robert Dick Wilson, whose name has gone out through all the world as a scholar of the first rank who stands for the full truthfulness of the Bible and who by common consent belongs to that great succession, indicated by the names of the Alexanders and the Hodges, that has made Princeton so famous as a center of sound evangelical learning and as a defender of the Christian faith. Dr. Wilson not only tells us *that* he is concerned, but *why* he is concerned, about Princeton Seminary; and his concern, supplemented as it is by that of the missionary sons of Princeton in the Orient, should certainly cause the Church to pause before it takes the control of this great institution out of the hands of those who have made it what it is.

In view of the fact that, according to said footnote, the 44 members of New Brunswick Presbytery which supported the action proposed to that body by Dr. John Dixon, a trustee of the Seminary, and seconded by Dr. Erdman, are "life-long Conservatives, true to every dogma of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith," despite the fact that seven of them are signers of the Auburn Affirmation, a reprint of an "Editorial Comment" in *The Presbyterian* of March 29th is enclosed. In judging the allegation that "not one in fifty of the thousand who signed it (the petition) has had the opportunity enjoyed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick of hearing the facts of the situation" it should be remembered not only that the members of New Brunswick Presbytery have had little or no opportunity of learning the facts not open to members of other presbyteries, with the exception of those members officially connected with the Seminary—the majority of the latter voted against Dr. Dixon's resolution—but that the more local a judgment, the more biased it is apt to be.

The Committee of One Thousand is only exercising the right of petition, possessed by every American citizen, in asking the next General Assembly not to disturb the plan under which Princeton Seminary has operated for over a hundred years and under which she has come to her present position in the field of Christian scholarship. Its petition has already been signed by thousands of other ministers and elders in all parts of the country. Ministers and elders who approve the content and purpose of the petition are invited to send name, church and address to The Princeton Committee, 1625 Graybar Building, New York City.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY
NORTH FIFTH STREET

Bless your dear old hulk! I've just finished your Princeton Theological Seminary speel. I thought you might be a dead one by this time; but you are the livest, sanest(perhaps the trickiest trickster of a) human that I have met with, well, since I saw you last.

Golly! Court, your speel is a beautiful piece of work. You have met the Scripture's ideal perfectly: "wise as a serpent(hence your trickery) and harmless as a dove" You can offend nobody and yet you have said everything that needed to be said. You old moss-back, how did you do it?

Ah, but you have a smoothe tongue and a way about you compact of a child's simplicity, a wise man's knowledge and a first rate diplomatist's persuasiveness! It should do the trick. I believe it will. Lord, ha' mercy on us! if the sense of the Church can stomach anything so raw as the Thompson Report's proposal for the Seminary. Though I am a liberal, the mere suggestion of such a thing gives me nausea.

I was sore over the Fosdick case, mad against Machen and Mac Cartney and everybody else in any way responsible for that irregular unfair proceeding; but I am just as mad now against the other group that wants to do an ungracious, unfair, wrong thing towards the Seminary.

I have partly made my peace with Machen (though I still owe him an apology for an act of which I am ashamed) and like him well though I never ceased to admire him as a man of rare ability. He really has a charming personality and is a gentleman to his fingertips.

Well, old Boy, I didn't mean to write you a letter, only to rejoice in your magnificent piece of work. It is a corker! It fits the bung-hole of the dear old Seminary's barrel perfectly, whence its essence - none of your grape-juice belly-wash either, but rare old choice hard liquor with a kick in it - might escape and be lost to the refreshment and quickening of good souls forever.

Every disinterested Princeton Seminary alumnus should rise up and call you Blessed.

Yours always,
Bob.

February 28, 1928

JOHN C. CHANEY
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW
SULLIVAN, INDIANA

March 28. 1928.

Princeton Theological Seminary.

Dear Mr. "Amicus":
W. Courtland Robinson;

I have your pamphlet setting for the "Troubles of the Seminary - and I venture to volunteer a word.

Trustees of a corporate body, especially of Benificial Institutions are expected to look after the temporal affairs of the "body", may not the Trustees of the Seminary confine themselves to the material (financial) affairs of the Seminary.

The Directors, like the Elders of the individual Church, should confine themselves to the spiritual matters, - teaching the scriptures and the like.

Trustees should not be Directors; and Directors should not be Trustees. They have different functions, their different functions should occupy them exclusively.

The President and the Faculty of the Seminary are employees of the Seminary, and should not be members of either Board. Their engagement is a function of the Directors. They should not be their own employers.

It is manifestly impracticable to en[illegible] these different Boards with the same duties, nor to give them co-ordinate jurisdiction of the same things. Here is where friction develops.

Preachers may appropriately domicile in the Board of Directors, as Laymen should on the Board of Trustees.

It is high time that the Presbyterian Church should recognize the distinction between Church and State, and come to practical administration of Church affairs. This philosophy should eliminate the present difficulty.

I shall be pleased to lend my professional services to the purposes herein submitted.

Fraternally

John C. Chaney

Unconvincing Propaganda

We have received from Herbert Adams Gibbons, of Princeton, N. J., author, war-correspondent and signer of the Auburn Affirmation, copies (1) of the action of New Brunswick Presbytery relative to the Protest of Chester Presbytery; (2) of a strictly partisan account of that meeting of presbytery, reprinted from *The Trenton Evening Times;* (3) of a letter by Dr. Charles R. Erdman, in which he states that the differences at Princeton are not doctrinal, without offering any proof other than a quotation from Dr. Thompson's misleading report to the last Assembly.

In face of the fact that every one of the seven signers of the Auburn Affirmation—according to which the full truthfulness of the Bible, the Virgin Birth, and bodily resurrection of Christ, his substitutionary atonement by which he rendered a satisfaction to divine justice, and his personal return, are beliefs which need not be held even by ministers of the Presbyterian Church—who attended that meeting of presbytery, voted for Dr. Dixon's resolution, Dr. Gibbons included, we are told that "those who voted to sustain the action of the General Assembly of 1927 were life-long Conservatives, true to every dogma of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith."

It is pertinent to add in this connection, in view of Dr. Erdman's strange statement, that "the differences which separate Trustees and Directors are not doctrinal," that that member of the Board of Trustees who signed the Auburn Affirmation was appointed by the Trustees as a member of their Committee of Five to confer with the Assembly's Committee of Eleven in reorganizing the Seminary. Evidently the Trustees as a body hold with Dr. Gibbons that an Affirmationist can be "true to every dogma of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith."

If men like Herbert Adams Gibbons, publicity agent for the minority at Princeton, is a "life-long Conservative and true to every dogma of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith," we can only say that we do not know what a conservative who is true to all the dogmas of the Presbyterian Church looks like.

What is more, in view of the further fact that *The Presbyterian Advance* recently advised us that copies of President Stevenson's pamphlet may be had from Dr. Gibbons, if Drs. Stevenson and Erdman are as orthodox as they have led us to believe, we are at a loss to understand why they accept the services of an Affirmationist like Dr. Gibbons in presenting their case to the church at large.

The writer, who lives in New Brunswick Presbytery, does not hesitate to say it is clap-trap and buncombe to say that "not one in fifty of the thousand who signed it (the Princeton Petition) has had the opportunity enjoyed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick of hearing the facts of the (Princeton) situation." As a matter of fact, the presbyters of New Brunswick Presbytery have had little more opportunity to inform themselves concerning the real facts of the Princeton situation than have other presbyters. Readers of *The Presbyterian* need not be told how poorly-informed and misleading Dr. Dixon's resolution was, or that it was adopted by a purely partisan vote in a presbytery in which the Modernist element—as in all presbyteries in the vicinity of New York City—is strong.

Reprinted from THE PRESBYTERIAN, published by The Presbyterian Publishing Company, 1217 Market Street, Philadelphia

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J

May 3, 1928

Mr. W. Courtland Robinson
Delhi, New York.

Dear Sir:

Your pamphlet relating to Princeton Theological Seminary was sent to me by my brother-in-law - who is the pastor of a Presbyterian Church in this state; knowing that I, living in Princeton for the last thirty years had intimate knowledge of the whole matter.

I have carefully read every word of your pamphlet, and being myself a Presbyterian "dyed in the wool", descended from eleven genera-

tions of clergymen well known and honored in the church for 600 years, both Craigheads and Wilsons, I feel that no one has any deeper love for it than I! But you know as well as I that Princeton Seminary has always been aggressively "narrow". "Old School" is that term they glory in applying to themselves. I have all the papers from my grandfather who himself participated in the struggle between the "Old School" and the "New". The Son of the Rev. Dr. James Patriot Wilson Pastor of the Old First Church at 7th and Locust Streets, Philadelphia, he was called to be pastor of the Neshaminy Church, twenty miles out of Philadelphia in 1838, at the time when the Old School and New School were

warring, and one of his first experiences was to stand in the pulpit of that old historic church with a cocked pistol on either side of him preaching his sermon on Sunday morning, an old elder standing guard, while a deputation of the "Old School Party" clamored outside the locked doors to demand that the Church be relinquished to them. The "New School" held the Church, and the Old School built for themselves another Church in Hartsville Village near by.

Those were strenuous times, when even Rev. Albert Barnes (who had succeeded my Great Grandfather as pastor of the Old First Church) was tried for "heresy", and little children were considered lost who died unbaptized!

The Old & New School were united in 1870, but many of the New School, my Grandfather among them, were quite reluctant to merge, however for the peace and growth of the church they consented.

Then in the '90s Chas. Briggs caused much trouble in Union Seminary and finally it withdrew from the control of the Ch.

On the first page of your pamphlet you admit or state that "no one connected with the controlling or teaching bodies of the Seminary has any desire to be rebellious towards the Church which brought it into being" - also you say "every person has full right to opinions concerning questions of administration.

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

You admit that "the General Assembly has final control and authority over its policies" - and yet when a Committee appointed by this General Assembly after two years consideration of the matter, decide that it would be better to have one Board of Control instead of two, thirty three members in all - 11 from the present Board of Directors, eleven from the Board of Trustees, and a third eleven from men outside of either present Board, that have not been biased by the opinions of those who have present control - thus putting new life in it, new voice in it so to speak - you (by you I mean Dr. Maclean & his Committee) if raise a fund of $50000.00 to

oppose the action of the supreme Court of the church which you have just admitted was acting within its rights. Is this justifiable? Is it reasonable? Is it even common sense?
Are not the "minority" leaving it to the General Assembly? Are they raising a fund to maintain and obtain their desires?
You make on your 3rd page a rather amusing statement: where you say (4) they (the Directors) have proven during 116 years capable etc." I doubt that not one of them has been there more than a quarter of that time!
It is like a statement made by one of the "Majority Faculty" We want to keep the Seminary as it was fifty years ago". What do they know how it was 50 years ago? They

with one exception. Dr. Hodge, even their ancestors were not there! They were none of them there forty years ago! And surely no one would take Dr. Hodge's ipse dixit, ~~after~~ given his illness that incapacitated him for so many months! When I came to Princeton in 1896 Drs. Paxton, Wm. Henry Green, and John De Witt were all in the Seminary, and a noted and notable trio - they were far better known and beloved than this warring crowd of dissenters. I use the word ~~abominably~~ advisedly! Machen, Armstrong, Hodge, Allis, R.D. Wilson, etc, and were they living they would every one have been on Dr. Erdman's side of this controversy. For Mrs. Lebbey, Dr. Green's daughter told me this winter, that it was the opinion of both her father and Dr. Paxton that "Charlie Erdman was one of the noblest, best beloved young men that had ever graduated from Princeton Seminary". Dr. De Witt was perhaps the most presentable, the most polished of all the Professors of the 90's. He had been a pastor for many years before coming to the Seminary. was a fine preacher and orator, thoroughly orthodox - decidedly "new School", a great addition to the Faculty in every respect. He also was devoted to Dr. Erdman expressing to me the opinion that "Dr E. was the finest acquisition to the Faculty that the Seminary had had in many years.

As to its being an "insult" to elect a new Board of Control I feel quite sure now

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

that you know! the findings of the Committee of eleven you will take back such an illogical statement. (See page 9½ inserted) On your 10th page you speak of Dr. Stevenson's accepting the position as Moderator of the General Assembly shortly after he became President of the Seminary — would not you have done the same? You know that no clergyman would refuse it. He was wanted or he would not have been elected! There was no wire-pulling as there was by Mr. Bryan in Mr. McCartney's case! 18 colored voters brought by him from the South to stuff the

9 1/2

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

It has been stated by you that Dr. Stevenson was not the choice of many of the directors, that there was much opposition to his election as Pres. elect of the Seminary. How then did it come to pass that Dr. Beach, the Secretary of the Board of Directors wrote them that he had been unanimously elected President? He demurred much before accepting, as he was devoted to his Baltimore people and they were very reluctant to part with him. Had he known anything

about it he would have remained where he was. He was a great and well known man and leader in the church, and accustomed to honor, respect and great consideration. All felt that Princeton was exceedingly fortunate to be able to get him.

Ballot-Box"! It was pure selfishness of the Seminary to expect Dr. Stevenson to do any thing else - they should have rejoiced that such an honor had been bestowed on their President - that such prestige had been given to Princeton - Seminary! (I have found since writing this that Dr. S. was urged by the Directors to accept the moderator ship) Dr. Erdman had been Pastor of our Church only six months when he was elected Moderator; would we have had him give it up for our sakes? that would have been the height of selfishness though we missed him greatly; (He is a pastor that could not fail to be missed). We rejoiced that he had the well-deserved honor; And whoever heard his sermon

as Moderator could not fail to be impressed with the deep spirituality of the man and his entire devotion to his Lord and Master! Would that every one member of this Faculty "Majority" had his nobility, his spiritual insight, and his intense earnestness of purpose in winning Souls to Christ!

Again, on page 11. you mention that when the great issues of Patriotism and National Honor were at stake in the greatest war the world ever suffered, Dr. Stevenson went to Coblenz with the "Army of Occupation". Could he have done anything else without failing in his duty to the young soldiers, his country and his God?

We think not. Had he remained at home he would probably have been criticized for his indifference. They were bound to find fault with him anyhow! They hesitated at any price. They never treated him with any sympathy or cordiality. They did not want him in the Seminary. He was not "cut and dried" enough for them! He was too interested, may I say, too youthfully interested in Christianity everywhere. In all the great activities of the Church He ~~was~~ is not their kind. So they say "Away with him"!

Can you expect Dr. Stevenson therefor

to endorse Dr. Maclean for the chair of Apologetics, when the man was one of those who opposed his policies; Did his best to thwart him in every way; Would you have done so?

In your chapter entitled "a Contest for Moderatorship" you have made a number of mistakes, also evidently you have "jumped at conclusions" because you have not been sufficiently informed in regard to "little happenings" in the Seminary life. Know evidently very little of the temperaments and characteristics of the various members of the faculty. "To know a man you

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

must live with him" is an old saying and if you have not had that opportunity you should at the very least have read every word of the report of the Special Committee before writing or publishing any criticism - That is the trouble with Dr. Craig, the editor of the Presbyterian - He acknowledged to me that he had not read for instance, Rev. Paul Martins report given at that time to this Committee - He acknowledges that the "Presbyterian", his paper, publishes statements that he knows are false, to try to draw Dr. Erdman into refuting them - In the matter of the Moderatorship every one knew that it had virtually been prom-

said to Dr. Erdman. He had stepped courteously and unselfishly aside a short time previously in favor of another. Dr. McCartney came to the Seminary one evening to address the students in Miller Chapel. (This was told me by a Seminary student who was "on deck" on every occasion.) During Mr. McCartney's address he made the following statement: "I have received a letter from some one intimately associated with Princeton Seminary telling me not to be a heresy hunter. I always know when I receive a dirty letter that it comes from Princeton." Would you not have drawn the conclusion from such a remark that he meant that it had come from some one in the Seminary who did not like his sermons? Some one listening to him? But what was the letter? It was a letter written to him by Dr. John De Witt, when he graduated from the Seminary! Was not this "disingenuous" to say the least? Paul would have called it so in Peter! And this student said: "When Dr. McCartney finished his address Dr. Erdman was the first person to walk up the aisle and shake hands with him". And the young fellow added with intense enthusiasm: "It was wonderful! I don't see how he could have done it! I never saw such a Christian as Dr. Erdman".

Another fact of which you are probably unaware is that Dr. Machen took his car

and a companion minister, and they personally visited every member of the New Brunswick Presbytery that they dared address on the subject, asking each one not to vote for Dr. Erdman. When asked if they had done this they became very angry, but refused to make any reply. And yet you insist that "Dr. Machen is truthful" the newspaper article which appeared in the Presbyterian to which you say Dr. Erdman replied - with some "heat" was written by Professor Allis, who the majority of Princeton people thought was on the editorial staff of that paper - Dr Erdman knew and recognized that it was written by Allis, and intended his article as a

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

reproof to him, as all those who have read the report of the Special Committee know.

As to the "Student Adviser" matter there is a paper on record in Dr. Martin's office of the Seminary signed by Dr. Maclean in which he advises the students to "elect Dr. Robert Dick Wilson as Student Adviser"! Go, look at that record yourself.

The students in a body marched over to Dr. Erdman, and presented him with a beautiful loving cup in appreciation of all he had been to them.

You say that when Dr. Erdman was elected Moderator his majority was small! So was Mr. Cartwright's

only about 18 - And if Bryan had not brought those men with him, and slated them for McCartney he would not have been elected Moderator at that time! More dissembling! Bryan was a Christian man, and spoke well on the subject of Foreign Missions - but he was a wily old politician and knew how to pull the wires - It is well he is gathered to his fathers for he was the greatest political nuisance we ever had when it came to Presidential elections! On page 14 - Mr. Mac[illegible] is a fine scholar but pardon me he is not a great man - for to be truly great he must have tolerance justice and love - and he is far more politic than you allow or he never would have so grossly misrepresented the "Minority" of the Faculty by sending out this paper to every one of the 60000 missionaries, Clergymen, elders etc of the entire Presbyterian Church even to those in China & Korea, asking for their signatures - giving the impression that Princeton Seminary has to be protected against the false doctrines of some of its Faculty and that is what he intended to do. It is by such misrepresentations that this $50000 has been secured to pay for all this propaganda with which you, Dr. Frank Stevenson and "the Presbyterian are flooding the mail - It was by such misrepresentation that Dr. Lowrie's letter was obtained and published in

the Presbyterian 21 - the letter which Dr. Lowrie has

CHARLOTTE D. WILBUR
27 UNIVERSITY PLACE
PRINCETON, N. J.

~~rish~~ repudiated and "the Presbyterian" has taken so long to acknowledge that it was received - Has Dr. Erdman paid any attention to all this propaganda? He is too busy about his Father's business to waste his time. The earthquake, the wind and the fire may ruffle his spirit, but they distract him not. He is only alert for the "still small voice". Dr. Craig, the editor of the Presbyterian openly admits that he has all this time been "trying to draw him out" - making false statements to make him refute them but all his efforts have been in vain. I told Dr. Craig a short time

ago that he evidently did not know a Christian gentleman when he saw one! I realize that those who are thus seeking to injure Drs. Erdman and Stevenson cannot appreciate them. Their courtesy, nobility, refinement and Christianity are lost on men made in a coarser mould! Do Armstrong, Hodge or Dr. Hodge Craig look like intellectual men? Or well bred men? Lastly you say on page 20. "Majorities must rule or chaos ensue." If that is so why when the General Assembly by an enormous majority vote expressed itself last year why are you opposing the Assembly? I have asked many questions which may

perhaps surprise you, and hope that the insight I have given you of the "little happenings" of which you have possibly never heard will give you a clearer view of "the troubles in Princeton Seminary" -

Very sincerely yours

(Miss) Charlotte D. Wilber

Topeka,Kansas,116Courtland,May 1,1928

Rev.W.Courtland Robimson,D.D.
Delhi,New York

My Dear Brother:

I have become anxious about what may result to the Church from what may take place at the General Assembly as to Princeton Seminary.Yesterday I reread your "Amicus My sympathies have been with the minority of the faculty.But I have felt strongly against the reorganisation scheme.It is no cure,but a deepening of the disease.

If the Committee reports according to the tenor of last year,no matterb which side carries the vote,controversy will be mad for years to come and will rage to the point of division,and nothing will be settled.Nothing but time and kindly discussion can cure the difficulty under which the Seminary and the whole church are suffering pain.

How can time and God's leading and overruling be applied to the crisis at the Assembly when the report is read and a motion to adopt is made?Not by either adoption or rejection. Only by its being laid on the table indefinitely without prejudice.

If such a man as Dr.Speer would make such a motion at the crisis moment it would carry the Assembly,and would stifle heated debate and partisanship in a large degree.So it seem to me.Then later in the Assembly let the Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries recommend the approval of the Professors elect with a a resolution of advice and challenge to all parties at Princeton and throughout the Church to cease shaking the Ark.

With great respect and all good wishes, David Cunningham

REV. JOHN H. THOMPSON
PASTOR GOOD WILL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
TEL. 27-F-2

MONTGOMERY, N. Y., April 23, 1928.

My dear Robinson,-

I have taken note of your sayings, and much as I hate to admit it, I must say that you have given, in my judgment, the best presentation of the Princeton matter that has been given in any single article. While what you wrote was truly tolerant without being indifferent, between the lines you were very properly nasty. While Erdman and Stevenson were both men for whom I had a warm regard, and as you know Erdman was a classmate, yet I am not blind to the fact they have struck the Presbyterian Church a blow that no recognized liberal could have struck. I have therefore "withstood them to th their face, for they were to be blamed". But be that as it may, I am writing you just now because I want to get a couple of copies of your article for the Elders who are to go to the Assembly from Hudson Presbytery, and I do not know where to get them. If you have them and will send me two and the bill, I will remit.

Hudson has sent four conservative men even though it is close to New York. What is more it endorsed the Chester Protest at the winter meeting. An attempt was made to rescind it at the spring meeting, but it failed. If things do not go right at this Assembly it will not be my fault.

I believe the daughter of a college classmate, Dr. A. M. Hollister is teaching in your school this year. Quite a girl I guess.

Well please send on the documents and so long,

Fraternally,

John H. Thompson

THE NASSAU CLUB
PRINCETON, N. J.

April 16. 1928

Dear Committee :—

Yesterday I was out of town, and this is the first moment I could answer your vigorous letter of the 13th.

Yes indeed, we made the fur fly at the meeting of Presidents last Tuesday. It was a complete reversal of the action taking at the special meeting in February, at which it was not present, when Dixon's paper was adopted by a large majority. He was nominated in

the most fulsome speeches ever heard in Rosslyn. His man declared that he was a sage, saint and master of the Rosslyn. His presence at the Assembly was essential in completing the work so well begun by putting the Seminary under one Board &c. The speech by which he was seconded was along the same lines of eulogy. Hung van Dyke, who was present the first time in twenty years made a speech after the first ballot, when it appeared that Dr. D. might not be elected, and urged the necessity of swinging this man who above all others represen

sented the position of those ("of us") who wanted "a new Primaton". But after all that eloquence his defeat was effected by the help of the Lord.
Hill is the only Elder elected the second year in succession in the history of the Rosgtry, so far as my recollection goes — a period of 22 years. Madden nominated him and said that the fact that he (Hill) was at the last Assembly was the best reason for sending him again &c. There was no camouflaging on the part of our group. We let Rosgtry know just where we stand, and no effort was made to enlist the support of any man who was not in sympathy with us in the great issues.
"I thank God and take courage".
I believe we have done a good work in the literature (preëminently your paper) which has been put into circulation, and Craig in the Rosgtry tenant has done yeoman service. We have better than a fighting chance. It looks to me like a reaction, or turn in the tide. Let us not shout until we are out of the woods, but meantime we may believe that "nothing is impossible with God". Thanking you for

your good letter. I am affectionately yours

Ans.

1407 Myra Ave
Los Angeles, Cal.
31 Mch 1925

Dr. W. C. Robinson,

Many thanks for the illuminating pamphlet on Princeton Seminary which you kindly sent me.

I have just read it and agree with it in toto.

Sincerely,

Edgar W. Wilson
(Princeton Sem. in '90-91,
Missionary in India since '94)

You confirmed a lot of things which I had guessed.

Bethany Temple Presbyterian Church
Fifty-third and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Pa.
W. B. Greenway, D. D.
Minister

April 12, 1928

Rev. Courtland Robinson
Delhi, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson :

We have a thousand addressed stamped envelopes for your pamphlets, but no phamplets. Is it possible to get another thousand? If so will you send them to Mr. Harry Palmer, 506 Race St., Philadelphia, Pa. at once ? Leaving the adjustment of the bill to you. Send whatever rebate you get to Mr. Harbison.

I am informed our enemies plan pushing MacAfee representing modernists, and extreme liberals, up to the time of the Assembly in order to hold them, and then swing them to Walker who is bidding for a conservative vote. That is good tactics.

Smith was practically unanimously elected a commissioner in the Philadelphia Presbytery, and received unanimous endorsement for moderator. I feel I have done justly by Smith as far as Phila. Presbytery is concerned. If the church-at-large wishes to turn him down, that is not a matter of our local concern.

I have a letter from Dunkel this morning in which he states he is very doubtful even if he will be a commissioner to the Assembly, as there is opposition in his own Presbytery. His letter states the above as follows : "I am thinking I will not get to the General Assembly as I am being punished by my own Presbytery for being an honest-to-goodness Presbyterian minister".

A letter from Macartney yesterday said he was hopeful McEwan would be sent from Pittsburg. Have not heard from the election. If so he would have the advantage of being a pastor. New Brunswick Presbytery yesterday elected one-half fundamentalists commissioners strictly on the basis of the issue. Dickson was defeated. Machen is first alternative. Your judgement is good. What is your advice?

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

WBG.EW

W B Greenway

Released for Publication May 29, 1927, and thereafter.

Publicity Department,
Presbyterian Board of Christian Education,
820 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

May 23, 1927.

An Open Address to the
General Assembly of the
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Dear Fathers and Brethren:-

A period of five months as acting Director of its Department of Publicity has been quite sufficient to give me an intimate, inside view of your Board of Christian Education, which view fully justifies the suggestion that it is high time for your reverend body to take some summary action with reference to the said Board's competency, but especially its loyalty to the historic standards of Christianity and the Presbyterian Church, in order that apostacy may cease, and that the processes of disintegration, tending to ultimate collapse, may be effectually stopped.

My de facto conclusions with reference to your said Board of Christian Education are as follows:

1. Any man that sincerely believes in "Christian" education is entirely out of place in the said Board, of which one of its chief administrative officers says that it ("Christian") is "an overworked, trite idea."

2. Any man that honestly believes in the Cross of Jesus Christ, and that for which it stands historically, is likewise out of place in said Board.

3. Any man that knows, and frankly believes, that "Christian" education and "religious" education are historic antagonists, fundamentally opposed to each other, is wholly out of his proper element in the said Board.

4. Any man that devoutly believes in his heart that the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and that "Thus saith the Lord" is final, is an object of derision to said Board.

5. Any man who earnestly contends that what the world needs is Christianizing, not curriculumizing, is a laughingstock to said Board.

6. Any man that objects to the displacement of the Cross (as the way to the consummation of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ) by a "key" (as the hope of future "civil-ization") is persona non grata to said Board.

7. Any man who dares to stand openly for the "Bible" school as over against the so called "Church" school, is quite impossible to said Board - though this thing (the "Church" school), again set forward as something not "trite" but novel (the offspring of the new knowledge), is as old as the Dark Ages of an apostate ecclesiasticism, and is a dangerous by-path.

8. Any qualified business man, who knows that "systematizing" cannot save the Publication (sales) Department of said Board as long as the Board itself (which is now the "Curriculum Committee" to all practical intents and purposes) continues to produce goods that "sales" (the Publication Department) cannot dispose of because loyal Presbyterian churches will not buy such material - any such man cannot long survive in the organization of said Board.

9. Any man who is something more than a producer of words (three-quarters of a billion octavo pages of them per annum!) - not to mention truant words, insidious words, faithless words, false words, weasel words, and words without number - is sure to be "anathema maranatha" to said Board.

10. Any man who is not insensative to honest criticism on the part of loyal Presbyterians possessed of common Christian sense, and who will not join in laughing such criticism to scorn in meetings of "The Staff", is doomed to the discard by said Board.

Much remains to be said; but, possibly, this much is sufficient.

On the side of efficiency, both time and heart forbid its consideration, except to say that it would be difficult to find, in any other great institution, such utterly incompetent administration, such a deplorable lack of executive ability and leadership; and in which essential dishonesty and outstanding cowardice occupy so large a place. God save the Church, if, with its millions of children and young people, it has fallen helplessly under the administration of small, disloyal minds, obsessed with an inscrutable egotism!

Therefore, until the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. returns from its present apostacy, as represented by its Board of Christian Education, (returns from a vain assumption of up-stage but blind intellectualism, to the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," the inmost soul of the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ), I can say to it but this: Convert Your Own; Let the "Heathen" Alone.....

A "brand pulckt from the burning," with my face set stedfastly toward "Christ, and him crucified," I am ever

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Henry A. Bomberger,

Acting Director.

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS ASSOCIATION
(Incorporated 1882)
Witherspoon Building
PHILADELPHIA

Allan E. Shubert
Manager

May 18, 1927.

COPY

Dr. H. A. Bomberger,
Room 820,
Witherspoon Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. Bomberger:

It is always a pleasure to me to commend one who has tackled a difficult job and has done it well. This world would be a lot better off if more people felt the same way.

I have followed with a great deal of interest the advertising which you have done since you took charge of the Publicity Department of the Presbyterian Church. It is the finest type of religious advertising I have ever seen, because:

1 - It commands attention (the first requisite of any good advertisement).

2 - Its message has been forceful.

3 - It has been dignified.

4 - It has never lost sight of the true Christian spirit.

It is to be hoped that you will continue this same type of advertising display. It will, I am sure, produce more dollars without begging and more denominational loyalty through dignity than any other advertising of a religious organization heretofore.

Wishing you ever increasing success, I am

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) ALLAN E. SHUBERT,

The Religious Press Association

AES:MK

PHILADELPHIA COMPANY
FOR GUARANTEEING MORTGAGES

224 LAND TITLE BUILDING

PHILADELPHIA

WILLIAM R. NICHOLSON, PRESIDENT
HENRY P. BROWN } VICE-PRESIDENTS
SAMUEL C. EDMONDS }
WILLIAM H. LAUER, SECRETARY
THEODORE G. HOMAN, TREASURER
ELI KINDIG JR., SALES MANAGER
PHILIP O. WIDING, MANAGER LOAN DEPARTMENT

November 4, 1927.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson,
Delhi, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

We thank you for your order received this morning, and have reserved for you, pending settlement as of December 1st, $1,000 of the first mortgage issue, premises 1615 Chestnut Street, carrying the guaranteed rate of 5½%.

We enclose descriptive circulars of our immediately available list of first mortgage bond issues, for your consideration, all of which carry the guaranteed rate of 5½%. We have not a single bond carrying the 5¾% rate at this time. Should such a bond become available, we will be pleased to submit it to you.

Thanking you, and awaiting your further commands, we are

Very truly yours,

Eli Kindig Jr.

Sales Manager.

W. Pittenbaum.
S.

PHILADELPHIA COMPANY
FOR GUARANTEEING MORTGAGES

224 LAND TITLE BUILDING

PHILADELPHIA

WILLIAM R. NICHOLSON, PRESIDENT
HENRY P. BROWN } VICE-PRESIDENTS
SAMUEL C. EDMONDS }
WILLIAM H. LAUER, SECRETARY
THEODORE G. HOMAN, TREASURER
ELI KINDIG JR., SALES MANAGER
PHILIP O. WIDING, MANAGER LOAN DEPARTMENT

November 12th, 1927.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson,
Delhi, New York

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

In accordance with your letter just received enclosing check for $1000, we have invested this fund in two $500. Bonds secured on Windermere Court Apartments, Wayne, Penna.

This is a very good location on the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad within fifteen miles of Philadelphia, and this issue was selected for your investment by Mr. William R. Nicholson, to whom you suggested that we refer the matter. These bonds are absolutely guaranteed by this company as to safety of principal and payment of interest.

Enclosed is receipt dated today so that interest will commence to accrue at the guaranteed rate of 5½% from today. Papers will be forwarded to you within a week or ten days.

Appreciating this opportunity for service, we are

Very truly yours,

Eli Kindig

Sales Manager.

H. Waterall
M.

PHILADELPHIA COMPANY
FOR GUARANTEEING MORTGAGES

224 LAND TITLE BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA

WILLIAM R. NICHOLSON, PRESIDENT
HENRY P. BROWN, SAMUEL C. EDMONDS } VICE-PRESIDENTS
WILLIAM H. LAUER, SECRETARY
THEODORE G. HOMAN, TREASURER
ELI KINDIG JR., SALES MANAGER
PHILIP O. WIDING, MANAGER LOAN DEPARTMENT

CAPITAL ASSETS OVER $5,000,000

October 31, 1927.

Rev. W. Courtland Robinson,
Delhi, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

In reply to your communication, we will offer as of December 1st, the first mortgage issue, premises 1015 Chestnut Street, carrying the guaranteed rate of 5½%. We have taken this issue at 6%, as described in the information forwarded to us, and as we collect the interest reserve ½ of 1%, which is the premium on our guarantee policy, and offer the issue for sale at 5½%.

The conservativeness of our mortgage is apparent where the original mortgage was $1,600,000, and on this conservative basis, we cannot secure a premium equivalent to our guarantee premium of ½ of 1% over and above the 6% interest.

Should you desire $1,000 of this issue, as of December 1st, we shall be pleased to reserve same for you, on the basis of 5½% guarantee.

Thanking you, and awaiting your further commands, we are

Very truly yours,

Edw Rittenhouse

for Sales Manager.

E.Rittenhouse.
S.

All right. I have also another thousand $1000 to invest at 5½% guarantee — ready now.

W. Courtland Robinson Esq

The Presbyterian Board of Ministerial Relief and Sustentation

HENRY B. MASTER, D.D.
General Secretary
W.S. HOLT, D.D., LL.D.
REV. REID S. DICKSON
Associate Secretaries
GEORGE A. HUGGINS
Actuary

GEORGE FRANCIS GREENE, D.D.
President
ORMOND RAMBO, ESQ.
Vice President

JOHN H. GROSS, D.D.
Treasurer
MISS F. JOSEPHINE FRAME
Assistant Treasurer

912 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REV. JAMES A. PRATT, FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, 27 WAVERLY PLACE, NEW YORK CITY

September 1 1927

Rev.Cortland W.Robinson,D.D.
Delhi , New York.

Dear Doctor Robinson;

Your Presbytery,is scheduled to meet on Monday September 26, will you pleae advise me time and place.

I hope to be able to be with you,we should get the resolutions regarding calls passed. Perhaps you will secure a place on the Docket for this item of business.

If there is any thing I can do -with all the other Presbyteries I have to look after - let me know and I will be glad to do what I can.

If I recall corectly, you are soon to have the Moderator of the General Assembly as your guest.

With kind personal regards,

I remain

Yours sincerely,

James A. Pratt

CABLE ADDRESS "HOPENNA"

PRIVATE OFFICE

Hotel Pennsylvania

CHESTNUT AND THIRTY-NINTH STS.
NEAR WEST PHILA STA. PENNSYLVANIA R.R

Philadelphia

December 28, 1927

Rev. W. C. Robinson,
Delhi, N.Y.

Dear Sir:

We have your letter of December 27th and beg to quote you for a double room with bath, a price of from $5.00 per day upwards or by the week at $30.00.

HOTEL PENNSYLVANIA, as you possibly know, is located in the better residential section of Philadelphia, yet within fifteen minutes of its social and business activities.

Thanking you for the inquiry and hoping for your further reservation, we are,

Yours very truly,

J.H. Bothwell,
Manager.

JHB:EH

CABLE ADDRESS "HOPENNA"

PRIVATE OFFICE

Hotel Pennsylvania

CHESTNUT AND THIRTY-NINTH STS.
NEAR WEST PHILA. STA. PENNSYLVANIA R.R.

Philadelphia

January 18, 1928

Mr. W. C. Robinson,
Delhi, New York,

Dear Mr. Robinson:

We have your letter of January 17th and note with pleasure that Mrs. Robinson and yourself will spend two weeks at HOTEL PENNSYLVANIA.

It is our pleasure to reserve a very comfortable room at $30.00 per week for this time, and we will take care of the trunk when it arrives and have it ready for your arrival.

Yours very truly,

J.H. Bothwell,
Manager.

JHB:EH

5851 Ashland Ave
Phila Pa
4/10/28
Dr. C Robinson
Dear Dr Robinson

I have read the Little Booklet sent me written by you and I feel you have done the Presbyterian church a great service by preparing such a book. What would I for instance know how to vote if I had not read that Booklet I had the honor of being elected a commissioner from Phila Presbytery to the General Assembly at Tulsa. and am glad to tell you I feel the solid delagation will vote if given a chance to leave Princton just as it is. But I feel the directors should insist on

The President Dr Stephenson
resigning. and I think
everything will be all right
them

I hope your Presbytery sends
you to the Assembly and they
should by all means
Especially at this time
We had two good friends of
yours at our house for dinner
Sat night the Miss Brintons
I showed them the little Booklet
written by you
I had a disagreement with My
Pastor over it he argued that
you did not like Dr Eidman and
was knocking at him. I said
you did not knock him any more
than the rest. he said some
other things that made me mad
and I told that you was my

old pastor and that I knew you as well as I knew him and that you knew what you was talking about. and I had always found you on the right side of the fence

When you are in Phila come out. we always have a Bed and somthing to eat and you are welcome at any time

Yours Sincerely

W B Culbert

P S

Remember me to Mrs Robinson